

German Historical Institute London

Bulletin

Volume XXX, No. 1

May 2008

CONTENTS

Preface	3
In Memory of Timothy Reuter	4
Article	
The Kidnapped King: Richard I in Germany, 1192–1194 (John Gillingham)	5
Review Article	
Situating German Orientalist Scholarship: Edward Said, Orientalism, and the German Predicament (Indra Sengupta)	35
Book Reviews	
Hans-Henning Kortüm (ed.) <i>Transcultural Wars from the Middle Ages to the Twenty-First Century</i> (Jan Willem Honig)	54
Samuel K. Cohn, Jr., <i>Lust for Liberty. The Politics of Social Revolt in Medieval Europe, 1200–1425: Italy, France and Flanders</i> (Knut Schulz)	59
Heinz Schilling, <i>Konfessionalisierung und Staatsinteressen: Inter- nationale Beziehungen 1559–1660</i> (Peter H. Wilson)	63
Andrew Thompson, <i>Britain, Hanover and the Protestant Interest, 1688–1756</i> (Alexander Schunka)	66
Carsten Kretschmann, <i>Räume öffnen sich: Naturhistorische Mu- seen im Deutschland des 19. Jahrhunderts</i> (Bernhard Rieger)	73
	(cont.)

Contents

Shulamit Volkov, <i>Germans, Jews, and Antisemites: Trials in Emancipation</i> (Ulrich Sieg)	77
Magnus Brechtken, <i>Scharnierzeit 1895–1907: Persönlichkeitsnetze und internationale Politik in den deutsch-britisch-amerikanischen Beziehungen vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg</i> (Holger Afflerbach)	82
Frank McDonough, <i>The Conservative Party and Anglo-German Relations, 1905–1914</i> ; John Ramsden, <i>Don't Mention the War: The British and the Germans since 1890</i> (Dominik Geppert)	85
Roland Hill, <i>A Time Out of Joint: A Journey from Nazi Germany to Post-War Britain</i> (Peter Alter)	92

Conference Reports

Germany 1930–1990: Structures, Lived Experiences, and Historical Representations (Julia Riddiford)	96
Anglo-German Mythologies in Literature, the Visual Arts and Cultural Theory (Angus Nicholls)	104
Partisan and Anti-Partisan Warfare in German-Occupied Europe, 1939–1945 (Ben Shepherd)	106
National Traditions or International Trends? Reconsidering the Fifties and Sixties as an Orientation Period in West Germany (Friedrich Kießling and Bernhard Rieger)	109
Sixth Workshop on Early Modern Central European History (Michael Schaich)	115

Noticeboard	120
--------------------	-----

Library News	
Recent Acquisitions	140

PREFACE

This year the *German Historical Institute London Bulletin* is appearing in a new cover. To mark the publication of volume thirty of the Institute's house journal, the editorial committee felt that it was time both to modernize its appearance and to revise some of the traditional content.

Visitors are making increasing use of electronic means to access information about the events arranged by the Institute. In response, we have set up an electronic newsletter that allows us to keep subscribers up to date about the Institute's programme easily and cheaply. Announcements in the *GHIL Bulletin*, by contrast, were often out of date by the time they reached readers. In future, therefore, we will not be publishing Seminar and Lecture programmes in the *Bulletin*, and encourage all those who are interested in the events arranged by the Institute to register for our newsletter, via our website, at <http://www.ghil.ac.uk/ghil_newsletter.html>. Seminar programmes are also still posted out.

The tried and tested, however, will be retained. The *GHIL Bulletin* will therefore continue to publish important articles and, above all, book reviews and research reports. It also seemed sensible to keep the section on conference reports.

The editors of the *GHIL Bulletin* hope that readers will like the new look, and that the contents will continue to provide interesting reading.

Andreas Gestrich

IN MEMORY OF TIMOTHY REUTER

John Gillingham's article is dedicated to the memory of Timothy Reuter (1947–2002), whose extensive library, given to the GHIL by Tim Reuter's widow, Georgina, in 2003, is certainly one of the most extensive single donations the Institute's Library has so far received. Using his books, we are reminded of a scholar who like few before or since has managed to serve two scholarly communities, that of England and that of Germany, with equal dedication and enthusiasm; he is now sadly missed by both.

Timothy Reuter's achievements as a historian are almost too many to count. A member of the prestigious *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* in Munich for twelve years, he had an unrivalled knowledge of German medieval history and of the endeavours and achievements of Germany's thriving scholarly community, which he never tired of translating into English and discussing abroad. All the while he published widely and profusely on all aspects of medieval life, politics, and thought, achieving defining breakthroughs in the fields of medieval politics, symbolic communication, and comparative European historiography. His five-volume concordance to the *Decretum Gratianum*, which he co-authored with Gabriel Silagi, is still unrivalled, as is his seminal textbook, *Germany in the Middle Ages*, published in 1991. He was the editor of the series Oxford Medieval Texts and, more recently, had taken upon himself the monumental task of supervising the publication of volume three of the new *Cambridge Medieval History*.

The son of a German-born father and an English mother, Timothy Reuter was a mediator and communicator between German and British scholars, a role that he fulfilled even after he left Munich to take up academic positions first in Exeter and then in Southampton. Thanks to him, the GHIL now possesses an excellent reference library on medieval European history that can be, and is, consulted by German and English scholars and students alike as, one may assume, he would have wished.

Jochen Schenk (GHIL)

ARTICLE

THE KIDNAPPED KING: RICHARD I IN GERMANY, 1192–1194

John Gillingham

In 1193 the rulers of Germany and England met for the first time in history. Their meeting offers an appropriate subject for a talk in memory of Tim Reuter, whose death in 2002 cut sadly short the life and career of the scholar who, choosing to work in both England and Germany, did more than any other twentieth-century English medieval historian to bridge the divides between Anglophone and German scholarship.¹ Or does it? After all, that first meeting was hardly a propitious one. The king of England, Richard I, returning from crusade, had been seized by the duke of Austria near Vienna in December 1192 and then handed over to Emperor Henry VI.² A contemporary illustration of the meeting shows Richard lying on the ground, kissing the emperor's feet in a ceremony of submission.³ Whether or not he had to endure quite so humiliating a ceremony, there is no doubt that he was subsequently kept a prisoner in Germany for more than a year. Not until February 1194, when he did

This article is based on a lecture given at the GHIL on 15 Feb. 2007 in memory of Tim Reuter.

¹ See the editor's introduction to Timothy Reuter, *Medieval Politics and Modern Mentalities*, ed. Janet L. Nelson (Cambridge, 2006), pp. xiii–xix.

² Stephen Langton, later archbishop of Canterbury, but at the time teaching in Paris, thought that Richard was being punished for the sins of his father: 'Ita his diebus quod in quodam magno rege captivato peccata patris eius vindicentur.' Cited in Philippe Buc, *L'ambiguité du livre: prince, pouvoir, et peuple dans les commentaires de la Bible au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1994), 62.

³ Reproduced in Theo Kölzer and Marlis Stähli, *Petrus de Ebulo, Liber ad honorem Augusti sive de rebus Siculis. Codex 120 II der Burgerbibliothek Bern: Eine Bilderchronik der Stauferzeit* (Sigmaringen, 1994), 171.

Article

homage to Henry and a king's ransom had been paid, was he released.⁴ The German chronicler, Otto of St Blasien, wrote: 'I prefer not to give the exact weight [of gold and silver] that he paid because if I did, it would be thought incredible and I would be accused of lying'.⁵ Hardly surprising that it would be almost 150 years before another king of England, Edward III in 1338, visited Germany.

On the other hand, the subject of Richard I in Germany is one which can readily be related to two of Tim's own principal fields of interest: in the first place, political structures and the conventions which shaped political action, the rules of the game (in Gerd Althoff's phrase, 'die Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter'); in the second place, Tim's hope that we English might become more German. Rather than repeat what he called 'one of the standard tropes of English medievalists: narrative sources unreliable, back to the archives', we should stop treating 'literary texts as low-grade archives which can be mined for "facts"', and instead follow our Continental colleagues in paying more attention to what such sources can tell us about the attitudes and political values of the time.⁶ In this case, by paying close attention to what contemporary and near-contemporary narrative sources, chiefly German and English but also Italian and French, have to say about Richard's captivity—and to what they do not say—we may be able to answer some fairly precisely formulated questions about the rules of the game. Did Duke Leopold VI of Austria and Henry VI play within the rules? What was the place of notions of honour within those rules? Whose rules were they anyway?

As Tim himself pointed out in his inaugural lecture when appointed to the chair of medieval history at Southampton University, the events of the 1190s used to loom large in traditional German

⁴ 'Richard's imprisonment had much in common with the modern kidnapping of wealthy businessmen to raise money.' Jean Dunbabin, *Captivity and Imprisonment in Medieval Europe 1000–1300* (Basingstoke, 2002), 5.

⁵ Franz-Josef Schmale (ed.), *Die Chronik Ottos von St. Blasien und die Marbacher Annalen* (Darmstadt, 1998), 112.

⁶ Timothy Reuter, 'The Making of England and Germany, 850–1050: Points of Comparison and Difference', in Alfred P. Smyth (ed.), *Medieval Europeans: Studies in Ethnic Identity and National Perspectives in Medieval Europe* (Basingstoke, 1998), 62; reprinted in Reuter, *Medieval Politics*, 284–99, at 294. Also *ibid.* 12. In this approach Tim was following the example of his teacher—and mine—Karl Leyser.

historiography. For much of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, 'the Germans' imagined past was one in which their rulers had exercised imperial hegemony over Europe'.⁷ In this view the dramatic events of 1194 – when the king of England did homage and Henry VI conquered Sicily – marked the apex of the medieval empire; the succession dispute between Staufer and Welf after Henry's death in 1197 came to be seen as the turning point from which the Reich never recovered. As late as 1986, when the English translation of Horst Fuhrmann's *Deutschland im hohen Mittelalter* was published, the early death of Henry VI was seen as a catastrophe for Germany.⁸ In all these events, not just in his performance of homage, Richard was deeply involved. The conquest of Sicily was paid for by the money sent to Germany to secure his ransom. Hence the opinion expressed by Willi Radczun in a book published in 1933: 'Die Zeit Heinrichs VI. bedeutet in der Geschichte der Beziehungen der beiden Staaten den Gipfelpunkt deutscher Überlegenheit über England' (In the history or relations between the two states, the period of Henry VI represents the peak of German superiority over England). The choice of the Welf, Richard's nephew, Otto of Brunswick, as Otto IV after Henry VI's death was promoted and financed by Richard. In Radczun's words: 'Damit war England an der Schwächung und Zerschlagung der staufischen Macht und somit am Niedergang des Kaisertums und der Machtstellung Deutschlands in Europa unmittelbar beteiligt' (In this way England was directly involved in weakening and destroying the power of the Staufer, and thus in the decline of the empire and Germany's position of power in Europe).⁹

⁷ Reuter, *Medieval Politics*, 14–15, 435.

⁸ Horst Fuhrmann, *Germany in the High Middle Ages c.1050 – c.1200*, trans. Timothy Reuter (Cambridge, 1986), 186. At the time Fuhrmann was president of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, where Tim worked for a dozen years and which he described as 'the heart of the German medieval tradition'. Reuter, *Medieval Politics*, 4, 14–15.

⁹ Radczun felt that the opinions held by Englishmen from the twelfth century onwards amounted to 'eine[r] Unterschätzung deutschen Wesens', which had lasted until his own day. He concluded by observing that whether the English would come to a new and better perception of Germans only time would tell. Willi Radczun, *Das englische Urteil über die Deutschen bis zur Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1933), 11–12, 115. I am grateful to Karsten Plöger for drawing my attention to this book.

Article

In these circumstances it is not surprising that Richard's time in Germany has been relatively intensively studied by German historians. The 700th anniversary of his capture and imprisonment, coming as it did not much more than twenty years after the creation of a new Reich in 1871, was the occasion for no fewer than three learned studies.¹⁰ Since then German scholars have produced a doctoral dissertation, Günther Bullinger's 'König Richard Löwenherz und Kaiser Heinrich VI',¹¹ and a number of articles, most recently one by Knut Görich.¹² By contrast there has been, so far as I know, only one article by a British historian.¹³ Of the three articles by British scholars on the aftermath of the captivity, two were written in German.¹⁴ Richard's early death in 1199 has never been regarded as a 'tragedy for

¹⁰ Aemil R. Kindt, *Gründe der Gefangenschaft Richards I. von England* (Halle, 1892); Karl Alois Kneller, *Des Richard Löwenherz deutsche Gefangenschaft 1192-1194* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1893); Hermann Bloch, *Forschungen zur Politik Kaiser Heinrichs VI. 1191-1194* (Berlin, 1892).

¹¹ Günther Bullinger, dissertation (University of Tübingen, 1947). I am very grateful to Hans Reither for making a copy of this typewritten thesis available to me.

¹² Georg Caro, 'Ein aktenmässiger Beleg zur Zahlung des Lösegelds für König Richard von England', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 97 (1906), 552-6; Albert Schreiber, 'Drei Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Gefangenschaft des Königs Richard Löwenherz', *Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, 26 (1931), 268-94; Heinrich Fichtenau, 'Akkon, Zypern und das Lösegeld für Richard Löwenherz', *Archiv für österreichische Geschichte*, 125 (1966), 11-32; Hans Eberhard Mayer, 'A Ghost Ship called Frankenef: King Richard I's German Itinerary', *English Historical Review*, 115 (2000), 134-44; Knut Görich, 'Verletzte Ehre: König Richard Löwenherz als Gefangener Kaiser Heinrichs VI', *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 123 (2003), 65-91. The most thorough book in German on Richard devotes one of its six chapters, sixty pages in all, to the captivity: Ulrike Kessler, *Richard I. Löwenherz: König, Kreuzritter, Abenteurer* (Graz, 1995), 248-306. Contrast the one chapter out of nineteen in John Gillingham, *Richard I* (New Haven, 1999), 222-53.

¹³ John Gillingham, 'William of Newburgh and Emperor Henry VI', in Walter Koch, Alois Schmid, and Wilhelm Volkert (eds.), *Auxilia Historica: Festschrift für Peter Acht zum 90. Geburtstag* (Munich, 2001), 51-71.

¹⁴ A. L. Poole, 'Richard the First's Alliances with the German Princes in 1194', in R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin, and R. W. Southern (eds.), *Studies in Medieval History Presented to F. M. Powicke* (Oxford, 1948); Jeffrey Ashcroft, 'Der

England'. As Tim pointed out, the grand narrative of England, its meta-history, was that of 'the continuous development of a state that is supposed to have been especially advanced, that is, centralised from the tenth century onwards'.¹⁵ From this point of view Richard was seen as a king who neglected his duty, and what happened to him in Germany an insignificant sideshow.¹⁶ And this is true of local as well as of national history. There is no place in England which makes much of its connections with 'the Lionheart'. In modern Austria and Germany there are small towns which do: Dürnstein on the Danube and Annweiler in the Pfalz.¹⁷

Despite the thoroughness with which this episode has been investigated by German scholars, there still remains more that can be said. Tim coined the term 'assembly politics' to encapsulate an interpretation of the political life of medieval western Europe before c.1200 as being structured around assemblies, those occasions when the ruler had in his presence a substantial number of people who were not permanent members of his entourage. In this period, he wrote, the 'public', in Jürgen Habermas's sense of the word, 'did not, except perhaps at moments of great crisis and heightened tension, have a permanent

Minnesänger und die Freude des Hofes: Zu Reinmars Kreuzliedern und Witwenklage', in Volker Honemann et al. (eds.), *Poesie und Gebrauchsliteratur im deutschen Mittelalter* (Tübingen, 1979), 219-37; Jeffrey Ashcroft, 'Die Anfänge von Walthers politischer Lyrik', in Adrian Stevens and Fred Wagner (eds.), *Minnesang in Österreich* (London, 1983), 1-24.

¹⁵ 'Symbolic Acts in the Becket Dispute', in Reuter, *Medieval Politics*, 186-7. Originally published in Gerd Althoff (ed.), *Form und Funktion öffentlicher Kommunikation im Mittelalter* (Sigmaringen, 2001), 201-25.

¹⁶ Indicative are John T. Appleby, *England Without Richard: 1189-1199* (London, 1965) and Ralph V. Turner and Richard R. Heiser, *The Reign of Richard Lionheart: Ruler of the Angevin Empire, 1189-1199* (Harlow, 2000), in which both the crusade and his imprisonment are dealt with in a chapter entitled 'The Government of England during the Third Crusade and German Captivity'. Note, however, Michael Clanchy's opinion that, paradoxically, Richard 'did more than any other king to give English government that central capability and continuity through record-keeping which made it such a formidable institution', M. T. Clanchy, *England and its Rulers 1066-1272* (2nd edn.; Oxford, 1998), 95.

¹⁷ At Annweiler in 1993 they celebrated the 800th anniversary of his imprisonment by having his heart brought from Rouen, and displayed. Similarly in

Article

existence: it came into being at assemblies and dissolved again when they ended'.¹⁸ In his fine essay on the Becket dispute he observed that high-profile conflicts could 'only be ended face to face, and before a public'. In public arenas pieces of political theatre were staged in which 'symbolically loaded actions' were performed; the actors spoke in the language which Tim christened 'Symbolic'. The appropriate stage for 'the symbolic expression of conflict, community, subordination and reconciliation in twelfth-century political theatre' was 'the royally summoned assembly, the *Hoftag* or great court Council'.¹⁹ In the story of Richard's captivity there were four such assemblies: the first at Regensburg in January 1193; the second at Speyer in March 1193; the third at Worms in June 1193; and the fourth at Mainz in February 1194, when Richard was finally set free.

But before I come on to them there is another piece of theatre to be considered, one acted out on a very different stage in Erdberg, then a suburb of Vienna: the capture itself.²⁰ If the theatre at the great assemblies was meant to have been carefully prepared beforehand, what took place here was much more of a happening, a partly improvised performance. But here, too, the event was staged in the sense that when they wrote about it, contemporary chroniclers set the scene with care, knowing what message they wanted to get across to their different audiences. The four main German accounts of the arrest, three of them written in the 1190s, all insist on the demeaning circumstances in which Richard was captured.²¹ These authors were following the official line, since the emperor himself, writing to

1999, the 800th anniversary of his death was commemorated by the issue of a postage stamp by the French government, but not the British.

¹⁸ Timothy Reuter, 'Assembly Politics in Western Europe from the Eighth Century to the Twelfth', in Peter Linehan and Janet Nelson (eds.), *The Medieval World* (London, 2001), 432–50, repr. in Reuter, *Medieval Politics*, 193–216, 198, 207. Cf. *ibid.* 453, for the inclusion of the thirteenth century within this interpretative framework.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* 169–70, 182–6.

²⁰ On the reasons for Richard's choice of return route and his disguise see Gillingham, *Richard I*, 230–1.

²¹ Contrast the absence of comment on the circumstances of the capture in the Austrian annals of Melk, Admont, and Kremsmünster, MGH SS 9, 506, 548, 587.

Philip Augustus, king of France, had said that Richard had been captured in a *domus despecta* (a contemptible house).²² According to the Marbach annals, this section of which seems to have been composed by an author quite close to Henry's court, Richard was taken 'in a little hut'.²³ According to the annals of Magnus of Reichersberg (an Augustinian house in the diocese of Passau), 'he was found hiding in a poor man's hovel, in the peasant's kitchen, preparing food for himself and his few companions'.²⁴ According to the narrative which I shall refer to as Ansbert, since its account of events between November 1190 and 1197 was composed by an Austrian cleric whose name may have been Ansbert, he was found and seized *in vili hospitio*. This account is especially valuable for setting out the duke of Austria's point of view. The king of England was humiliated, but it was exactly what he deserved, for on crusade he had humiliated the duke. His arrest was a judgement of God and Leopold treated him better than he deserved.²⁵

The longest German account, by Otto of St Blasien, was written some fifteen years later. The king of England knew that at the siege of Acre he had wronged Duke Leopold, so he decided to travel secretly through Austria. He hoped to escape recognition by helping out in the kitchen, turning the spit with his own hand, but forgetting to remove an expensive ring. He was recognized by a member of Leopold's household who hastened to tell the duke, by chance then in Vienna. Leopold was highly amused to find the king holding a roast chicken, took him prisoner, and by placing him in close con-

²² The text of Henry's letter to Philip survives only in the copy which an English royal clerk entered into his chronicle. Roger of Howden, *Chronica*, ed. W. Stubbs, 4 vols. (R[olls] S[eries], 1868–71), iii. 195–6. It is not, however, an English forgery since it was drawn upon by Philip's 'official historian', Rigord of St Denis, *Histoire de Philippe Auguste*, ed. E. Carpentier, G. Pon, and Y. Chauvin (Paris, 2006), 314–16.

²³ *Chronik Ottos und Marbacher Annalen*, 186. The author was possibly one of Henry's chaplains, Friedrich, provost of St Thomas's, Strasburg.

²⁴ *Chronicon Magni Presbiteri*, MGH SS 17, 519–20. See Wilhelm Wattenbach and Franz-Josef Schmale, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter: Vom Tode Kaiser Heinrichs V. bis zum Ende des Interregnum*, i. (Darmstadt, 1976), 203–8.

²⁵ A. Chroust (ed.), *Historia de expeditione Friderici*, MGH SRG (1929), 101–2, 105.

Article

finement, paid him back as he deserved (*digna recompensatione reddens ei, quod meruit*). Although many criticized the duke for this, regarding it as sacrilegious treatment of a pilgrim to the Holy Sepulchre, their condemnation was, Otto concluded drily, of little use to the captured king.²⁶ Of these four accounts, Otto's is the only one to refer to Richard as a pilgrim,²⁷ but in his narrative it takes second place behind the amusing anecdote of the hapless king in the kitchen. It all made for a good story, one that was widely known.²⁸ It was alluded to in the most overtly pro-imperial of all narratives, the *Liber ad honorem augusti*, a long Latin poem composed between 1195 and 1197, telling the story of events in south Italy and Sicily from 1189 to 1194. Its author, Peter of Eboli (near Salerno), in offering his work to Henry VI, described himself 'as the loyal servant of the emperor'.²⁹ His verses described how Richard disguised himself as a shabbily dressed kitchen servant doing menial work in the vain hope of escaping the emperor's all-seeing eyes.³⁰ From Peter of Eboli the story found its way into William the Breton's epic poem in praise of Philip Augustus, the *Philippidos*.³¹

Vivid though the story of the king in the kitchen was, we hear nothing at all about it from the four English authors writing in the 1190s who had something to say about the circumstances in which

²⁶ *Chronik Ottos und Marbacher Annalen*, 110–12.

²⁷ A continuator of the Reichersberg annals, writing after the death of Magnus in 1195, observed that one of the reasons for the quarrel between Pope Celestine and Henry VI was the capture of the king of England on pilgrimage. *Chronicon Magni, Continuatio*, 523.

²⁸ e.g. by Sicard of Cremona. See Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica*, ed. G. Scalia (Bari, 1966), 26; 'ad ignem sedens et gallinam assans', *Annales Stadenses*, MGH SS, 16, 352.

²⁹ 'Ego magister Petrus de Ebulo, servus imperatoris fidelis, hunc librum ad honorem Augusti composui', Kölzer and Stähli, *Petrus de Ebulo*, 245.

³⁰ 'Cesaris ut fugeret leges tuus, Anglia, princeps | Turpis ad obsequium turpe minister erat. | Quid prodest versare dapes, servire culine?', Kölzer and Stähli, *Petrus de Ebulo*, ll. 1047–51.

³¹ William the Breton, *Philippidos*, bk IV, ll. 343–4, borrowing verbatim the last of the three lines quoted in the previous note. H. F. Delaborde (ed.), *Œuvres de Rigord et de Guillaume le Breton*, 2 vols. (Société de l'histoire de France; Paris, 1882–5).

Richard was captured: Roger of Howden, Ralph of Coggeshall, William of Newburgh, and Gervase of Canterbury. They portrayed him as disguised either as a merchant on pilgrimage, or as a Templar.³² A fifth German account, that written by Arnold of Lübeck, perhaps as late as 1210, also had Richard and his followers dressed as Templars travelling *peregrino more*. In the light of Arnold's sympathy for Henry the Lion and Otto IV, it is hardly surprising that he should have preferred to represent their kinsman in the honourable guise of a pilgrim rather than in the demeaning disguise of a kitchen hand.³³ Equally, given how much importance he attached to pilgrimages to the Holy Land, it seems reasonable to interpret his comment on Richard's captivity – 'Thus on account of our sins the Holy Land has still not been liberated' – as criticism of duke and emperor.³⁴ Looked at in this light, Peter of Eboli's work is intriguing. In the one surviving manuscript, apparently a copy on which the author himself had worked, it is lavishly illustrated. Whereas the Latin text described Richard as a badly dressed kitchen servant, the three images on the facing page all portrayed him as a pilgrim, and it was as a crowned pilgrim that he kissed the emperor's feet.³⁵

³² Howden, *Chronica*, iii. 185–6; Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon Anglicanum*, ed. J. Stevenson (RS, 1875), 54–5; 'characterem adhuc Dominicum portans', William of Newburgh, *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, ed. R. Howlett, in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, vols. i and ii (RS, 1884), i. 387; Gervase of Canterbury, *Opera Historica*, ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols. (RS, 1879–80), 513. For analysis of their views see Görich, 'Verletzte Ehre', 67–8.

³³ Arnold of Lübeck, *Chronica Slavorum*, ed. J. M. Lappenberg, MGH, SRG (1868, 1930), bk IV c. 16, pp. 146–7.

³⁴ As suggested by B. U. Hucker, 'Die Chronik Arnolds von Lübeck as "Historia Regum"', *Deutsches Archiv*, 44 (1988), 98–119, at 105. On Arnold's enthusiasm for pilgrimage and his concern for the Holy Land see Volker Scior, *Das Eigene und das Fremde: Identität und Fremdheit in den Chroniken Adams von Bremen, Helmolds von Bosau und Arnolds von Lübeck* (Berlin, 2002), 252, 293–309. I owe this reference to the kindness of Michael H. Gelting.

³⁵ Kölzer and Stähli, *Petrus de Ebulo*, 171. Stähli noted that a piece of parchment had been cut from the top right hand corner of this page. 'Es sollte wohl als Blattweiser dienen und auf die Darstellung des beliebten Held aufmerksam machen', *ibid.* 252. Even if so, there is no telling when the cut was made.

Article

If this meant that the message of the *Liber ad honorem Augusti* is somewhat ambiguous, the same cannot be said of the depiction of Richard's capture by English chroniclers. All agree that he was detected only because his servant at the market was questioned under torture, and revealed his hiding-place. When arrested, he reached for his sword, not for a kitchen implement. According to Coggeshall, the king, seeing he was in no position to resist so many barbarians (*apud tot barbaros*), insisted on surrendering to the duke alone. When the duke arrived, he went to meet him and proffered his sword.³⁶ This was a warrior's honourable surrender. But—and this I want to emphasize—despite this obvious attempt to rescue their king's reputation and honour, the English authors all recognized that the duke had a grievance, and understood that he would seek redress.³⁷

It was a good story, of a proud king brought low.³⁸ The siege of Acre and the Third Crusade had been spell-binding events. There, in the words of a contemporary Templar, 'armies from Asia and Africa fought against Christian Europe, two parts of the world against the third part'.³⁹ After the death of Frederick Barbarossa and the shameful departure of King Philip of France, Richard was left as the com-

³⁶ Howden, *Chronica*, iii. 186; Newburgh, *Historia*, i. 383; Coggeshall, *Chronicon*, 55–6; Gervase of Canterbury, *Opera Historica*, i. 513. See Görich, 'Verletzte Ehre', 65–8 for an analysis.

³⁷ John T. Appleby (ed.), *The Chronicle of Richard of Devizes* (London, 1963), 46–7; Coggeshall, *Chronicon*, 59; Newburgh, *Historia*, i. 383 recognizing Duke Leopold's grievance, though downplaying it; Gervase of Canterbury, *Opera Historica*, i. 514. This did not prevent Coggeshall and Ralph of Diceto criticizing Austrians in general. 'They are savages who live more like wild beasts than men', wrote the dean of St Paul's, Ralph of Diceto, *Opera Historica*, ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols. (RS, 1876), ii. 106.

³⁸ 'Richardus qui gloria omnes anteire voluit et omnium indignationem meruit', Chroust (ed.), *Historia de expeditione*, 101; 'Richardus rex Anglicus devicta Akkaron et aliis triumphis titulis elatus . . . quia non Deo sed suis viribus queque circa se fortunata ascripsit', *Continuatio Cremifanensis*, MGH SS 9, 548.

³⁹ Hans Eberhard Mayer (ed.), *Das Itinerarium peregrinorum: Eine zeitgenössische englische Chronik zum dritten Kreuzzug in ursprünglicher Gestalt* (Stuttgart, 1962), 327–8.

manding figure on the Christian side.⁴⁰ He remains the only king of England who personally played a leading role on the world historical stage. In this intercontinental war his opponent was one of the greatest of all Muslim leaders, Saladin, a man much admired by his Christian enemies, just as Richard's abilities were admired by his Muslim enemies.⁴¹ In one song, Walther von der Vogelweide paired Richard and Saladin together as model rulers.⁴² A contemporary Londoner called Richard *stupor mundi* (the wonder of the world). Although it has always been said that Frederick II of Hohenstaufen was the ruler to whom that label was applied it had, in fact, been used of Richard some forty years earlier – and of Pope Innocent III a few years earlier still.⁴³ Now the king had been taken prisoner in distinctly unregal circumstances. The news of the capture and humiliation of so great a man travelled fast through neighbouring realms.⁴⁴

Richard was captured on 21 December 1192. A week later Henry VI wrote to King Philip of France to tell him the glad tidings.

Because our imperial majesty has no doubt that your royal highness will take pleasure in all of those providences of God

⁴⁰ Philip himself acknowledged that he had been shamed by his return to his own realm. Christopher R. Cheney and William H. Semple (eds.), *Selected Letters of Pope Innocent III Concerning England: 1198–1216* (London, 1953), 6. According to Andreas of Marchiennes, Philip and those who returned to France with him acted like frightened rabbits, *Historia regum Francorum*, MGH SS, 26, 212.

⁴¹ Gillingham, *Richard I*, ch. 2, 'Through Muslim Eyes'.

⁴² They knew how to win reputation and honour through generous giving: *wie man mit gâbe erwirbet prîs und êre*. Martin Jones, 'Richard the Lionheart in German Literature of the Middle Ages', in Janet Nelson (ed.), *Richard Coeur de Lion in History and Myth* (London, 1992), 85. For Richard's reputation see also Cyril Edwards, 'The Magnanimous Sex-Object: Richard the Lionheart in the Medieval German Lyric', in Keith Busby and Erik Kooper (eds.), *Courtly Literature: Culture and Context* (Amsterdam, 1990), 159–77.

⁴³ '*Stupor mundi*: 1204 et un obituaire de Richard Coeur de Lion depuis longtemps tombé dans l'oubli', in M. Aurell and N.-Y. Tonnerre (eds.), *Plantagenêts et Capétiens. Confrontations et heritages: Actes du colloque de Poitiers et Fontevraud, Mai 2004* (Turnhout, 2006), 397–411.

⁴⁴ Chroust (ed.), *Historia de expeditione*, 105.

Article

which exalt us and our empire, we have thought it proper to inform you of what happened to Richard, king of England, the enemy of our empire and the disturber of your kingdom. . . . His ship was driven by winds onto the Istrian coast and there it was wrecked at a place between Aquileia and Venice. By God's will he and a few others escaped. A loyal subject of ours, Count Meinhard of Görz . . . calling to mind the treason, treachery and mischief of which Richard had been guilty in the Holy Land, went to arrest him. . . . [H]e escaped . . . but the roads were watched and guarded, and our dearly beloved cousin, Leopold duke of Austria, captured the king in a despicable house near Vienna. He is now in our power. We know that this news will bring you great happiness.⁴⁵

For Henry to write on 28 December that Richard 'is now in our power' implies that he thought the outcome of the assembly due to meet in Regensburg in January 1193 had already been fixed. As Gerd Althoff, Tim Reuter, and others have persuasively argued, this is what was expected of assemblies. We are dealing 'with polities which collectively feared and shunned open expression of conflict or disagreement. . . . Public gatherings carried particular risks in a political culture in which rank and honour were strongly stressed. People looked for a carefully planned staging of events . . . in which the outcome sought could if possible be agreed beforehand with all participants.'⁴⁶ No different, then, from party and international conferences these days. But at Regensburg, the first of my four assemblies, this was not the case.⁴⁷ Richard was taken to Regensburg by the duke of Austria, but then not handed over to the emperor, as Henry had evidently anticipated. Instead Leopold took him back east again.

⁴⁵ Howden, *Chronica*, iii. 195–6.

⁴⁶ Reuter, *Medieval Politics*, 184, 203.

⁴⁷ Early in December a *curia generalis* had been summoned for 6 Jan. to confirm a peace between the duke of Austria and counts of Ortenburg; this it did. 'Ibi pax confirmata est inter principes ante inter se dissidentes', *Chronicon Magni*, 519–20. Documents in Henry VI's name were issued at Regensburg from 10 to 13 Jan., then again on 27–28 Jan. G. Baaken and Johann Friedrich Böhmer (eds.), *Regesta Imperii: Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Heinrich VI. 1165 (1190)–1197* (Cologne, 1972–9), nos. 272–5, 277–8.

According to Ansbert, 'the emperor listened to evil counsellors and was minded to use violence in order to get his hands on Richard'.⁴⁸ Henry may have seen Richard at Regensburg; but I do not think that in these circumstances we can talk of a meeting between them.⁴⁹ It took another month or so of negotiations between Henry and Leopold before they came to terms. Ansbert inserted into his chronicle the text of the treaty they agreed on 14 February, the principal point of which was that they would share 50–50 the ransom they set at 100,000 marks.⁵⁰ Richard was then handed over to the emperor, at Speyer, according to Ansbert, at about Easter (28 March) according to both Magnus and Ansbert.⁵¹

But at this point, if we follow the German sources, Richard disappears almost completely from view and does not re-emerge until his release in February 1194. For example, the Marbach annalist, after telling the story of how Richard came to be captured by Leopold, simply said that 'he was handed over to the emperor, held captive for more than a year, until in return for 150,000 marks he obtained the freedom of going home'.⁵² In other words German sources say nothing at all about what happened at the *Hoftag* at Speyer in March 1193, or at the assembly at Worms in June. Indeed, we might be tempted to think that those two assemblies were just the inventions of historians writing in England, were it not for the survival of imperial charters

⁴⁸ *Chronicon Magni*, 520; Chroust (ed.), *Historia de expeditione*, 102–3; Heinrich Fichtenau and Erich Zöllner (eds.), *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Babenberger in Österreich*, iv. pt. 1 (Vienna, 1968), no. 921.

⁴⁹ Contrast Gillingham, *Richard I*, 235, and Görich, 'Verletzte Ehre', 79.

⁵⁰ Chroust (ed.), *Historia de expeditione*, 103–5.

⁵¹ *Chronicon Magni*, 520; Chroust (ed.), *Historia de expeditione*, 103. Richard was certainly at Speyer before Easter since he wrote to the monks of Canterbury from there on 26 Mar. William Stubbs (ed.), *Epistolae Cantuarienses: Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I* (RS, 1865), ii. 361–2. According to Ralph of Diceto, Leopold formally gave Richard into the emperor's custody on 23 Mar. Diceto, *Opera*, ii. 106.

⁵² *Chronik Ottos und Marbacher Annalen*, 165. As Chroust noted, the chronicler passed over the negotiations between Henry and Richard 'mit bemerkenswerter Kürze', Chroust (ed.), *Historia de expeditione*, 107, n. 3. Cf. Georg Waitz (ed.), *Chronica regia Coloniensis*, MGH SRG (1880), 156.

Article

issued there, and their lists of witnesses.⁵³ Secondly, German sources tell us virtually nothing about where and in what circumstances Richard was held prisoner.⁵⁴ Thirdly, they contain not one word about the subsequent negotiations over the ransom, or about the contacts between Henry VI and the king of France in which the latter tried to persuade Henry to keep Richard in prison for longer, or to send Richard to him. Given the way in which Henry VI was able to exploit the capture of Richard I in order to finance his triumphant, and in the short run very successful, invasion of the kingdom of Sicily, why did contemporary German narratives remain so silent about these matters?

For the events of the assemblies at Speyer and Worms we have to go to historians writing outside Germany, above all, to four English historians who in their different ways were remarkably well informed, and all of them writing in the 1190s: Roger of Howden, Ralph of Coggeshall, Ralph of Diceto, and William of Newburgh.⁵⁵ Roger of Howden was the most widely travelled of all medieval English historians; he had been a king's clerk since the 1170s, went on crusade in 1190–1, and was an assiduous collector of documents, many of which we possess only because he inserted a copy into his chronicles, both the *Gesta Henrici Secundi et Ricardi* once attributed to Benedict of Peterborough, and the *Chronica*.⁵⁶ The Cistercian Ralph of

⁵³ Henry VI was at Speyer on 23 and 28–29 March, at Worms on 28–29 June, *Regesta Imperii*, nos. 283, 285–6, 303–4.

⁵⁴ Otto of St Blasien, writing after both Henry and Richard were dead, is the only important German chronicler to say anything at all about what happened to Richard between Easter 1193 and February 1194. He noted that Henry had Richard sent in chains to Worms and that many great men from the king of England's land came to visit him. *Chronik Ottos und Marbacher Annalen*, 110–12. According to a Salzburg annalist, for a whole year the emperor kept Richard *vinctum* (but this might mean little more than 'in custody'), MGH SS 13, 240.

⁵⁵ Gervase of Canterbury must also have been well-informed about Richard in Germany, but generally chose to concentrate on the affairs of the church of Canterbury.

⁵⁶ See John Gillingham, 'The Travels of Roger of Howden', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 20 (1998), 151–69, reprinted (and revised) in id., *The English in the Twelfth Century* (Woodbridge, 2000), 61–91; id., 'Writing the Biography of Roger of Howden, King's Clerk and Chronicler', in David Bates, Julia Crick,

Coggeshall, who completed this part of his chronicle in 1195, claimed to have had one of Richard's chaplains, Anselm, as an informant.⁵⁷ Ralph of Diceto, dean of St Paul's, was a friend and correspondent of two of Richard's ministers, the chancellor, William Longchamp, and the chief justiciar, Walter of Coutances, both closely involved in the negotiations which led to the king's release.⁵⁸ William of Newburgh was able to supplement the material he found in Roger of Howden's chronicle, thanks to his access to a uniquely well-informed source, Master Philip of Poitou, Richard's confidential clerk who stayed with the king throughout his time in Germany.⁵⁹

Roger of Howden's is the most detailed narrative of events in Germany during those twelve months. In his version, at an assembly which had been summoned to meet on Palm Sunday (21 March), the emperor accused Richard of betraying the Holy Land, of plotting the assassination of Conrad of Montferrat, and of breaking agreements he had made with him. To this Richard was said to have replied with such force and eloquence that the charges were dropped and Henry VI gave him the kiss of peace.⁶⁰ No German chronicler chose to report any such accusations levelled at Richard in 1193.⁶¹ Of the pro-impe-

and Sarah Hamilton (eds.), *Writing Medieval Biography 750–1250: Essays in Honour of Frank Barlow* (Woodbridge, 2006), 207–20.

⁵⁷ Coggeshall, *Chronicon*, 54. F. M. Powicke, 'Roger of Wendover and the Coggeshall Chronicle', *English Historical Review*, 21 (1906), 286–92.

⁵⁸ Diceto, *Opera*, ii. 112–13, 127–8, 135–50, 157–8, 177–80.

⁵⁹ Gillingham, 'William of Newburgh and Emperor Henry VI', 51–71. Philip was rewarded with the bishopric of Durham and became in effect Richard's minister for imperial affairs.

⁶⁰ Howden, *Chronica*, iii. 198–9; cf. William of Newburgh, *Historia*, i. 387–8. Coggeshall, *Chronicon*, 58–60. None locate the meeting.

⁶¹ Although the Marbach annalist presumably alluded to one of the charges in his account of the year 1190, where he claimed that when Richard took possession of Messina in October and made a treaty with Tancred, he broke an oath sworn to Henry VI. According to him, the kings of France and England and the count of Flanders had obtained Henry's permission to travel through all his lands on condition that they did not infringe his rights. *Chronik Ottos und Marbacher Annalen*, 180–2. There is no other evidence of such an oath which, in any case, Philip II would also have broken when he recognized Tancred as king and was assigned lodgings in the royal palace in Messina. For discussion of the accusation see Joseph Huffmann, *The Social*

Article

rial narratives only Peter of Eboli offered something of the sort, though without specifying either date or place. Henry VI, having summoned an 'imperial senate, as is the custom', referred to Richard's dealings with Tancred of Sicily as an offence *in nostrum ius*. According to this version, Henry was so moved by the king's humble submission illustrated on the facing page of the manuscript (see above p. 5) that he decided to set him free—something which, Peter claimed with remarkable boldness, neither pope nor any amount of money would ever have persuaded him to do.⁶² The language of the English chroniclers also indicates that Richard made some symbolic gesture of submission, even if it is unlikely to have been the Byzantine/Sicilian *proskynesis* depicted in the *Liber ad honorem Augusti*.⁶³ Their dispute over, Henry and Richard were now firm friends, and Henry offered to effect a reconciliation between Richard and Philip of France in return for an agent's commission of 100,000 marks.⁶⁴ According to Howden, the onlookers wept with joy. No doubt the whole scene had been orchestrated in advance, tears and all.⁶⁵ Both Howden and Coggeshall report that before the rulers met,

Politics of Medieval Diplomacy: Anglo-German Relations 1066–1307 (Ann Arbor, 2000), 134–8. Only on the assumption that Trautz accepted the conventional view of Richard as an 'unerträglicher Egozentriker von törichter Rücksichtslosigkeit' is it possible to understand his statement that Richard's conduct towards Henry was always 'unbedacht und gewaltsam'. Fritz Trautz, *Die Könige von England und das Reich 1271–1377: Mit einem Rückblick auf ihr Verhältnis zu den Staufern* (Heidelberg, 1961), 81.

⁶² *Petrus de Ebulo*, ll. 1053, 1059–64.

⁶³ According to Howden, Henry made demands which Richard, even under threats of death, refused to accept, and Klaus van Eickels has suggested that these could have included 'eine erniedrigende Form der Unterwerfung', *Vom inszenierten Konsens zum systematisierten Konflikt: Die englisch-französischen Beziehungen und ihre Wahrnehmung an der Wende vom Hoch- zum Spätmittelalter* (Stuttgart, 2002), 327.

⁶⁴ The word ransom (*redemptio*), freely used by chroniclers, was studiously avoided in all official letters until Pope Innocent III used it, but by then Henry was dead. Kessler, *Richard I. Löwenherz*, 267–8.

⁶⁵ Gerd Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale: Symbolik und Herrschaft im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 2003), 157–8. According to Althoff, given that Richard was accused of trying to have Henry murdered, the most severe punishments would have been in order. This was not, however, among the charges.

intermediaries went to and fro.⁶⁶ Nonetheless, even if both emperor and king stuck to a pre-arranged script, it seems clear that Richard put in a bravura performance. Even William the Breton, Philip's court poet, was impressed: 'When Richard replied, he spoke so eloquently and regally, in so lionhearted a manner, that it was as though he had forgotten where he was and the undignified circumstances in which he had been captured, and imagined himself to be seated on the throne of his ancestors at Lincoln or at Caen.'⁶⁷ Here, then, we have a good example of assembly politics operating as it should, culminating in 'ritualised behaviour symbolising closure and re-affirming an order which should if at all possible be seen not to have been threatened'.⁶⁸

But although it symbolized closure, it did not bring it. If these were the rules of the game, then Henry broke them.⁶⁹ There was no closure, far from it, just more negotiations during which Richard came under severe pressure. Eventually a new deal was arranged, and another imperial court, *totius Alemanniae generalis conventus*, summoned so that it could be proclaimed.⁷⁰ It met, as imperial charters and their witness lists show, at Worms at the end of June 1193.⁷¹ Once again, we have only the reports of English chroniclers to go on, and, above all, Roger of Howden's copy – the only surviving one – of the text of the new agreement made between Richard and Henry. This time Richard agreed to pay 150,000 marks (£100,000) for his freedom. There had been a 50 per cent hike in the sum demanded for his release.⁷² What pressure had been brought to bear on Richard to

⁶⁶ Howden, *Chronica*, iii. 199; Coggeshall, *Chronicon*, 58.

⁶⁷ William the Breton, *Philippidos*, IV, 393–6. William placed this episode at Mainz, soon after Leopold had handed Richard over to the emperor and made the king's release follow immediately after. Presumably he had heard about Richard's bearing from King Philip's envoys to the imperial court. On Richard's eloquence see Coggeshall, *Chronicon*, 59–60.

⁶⁸ Reuter, *Medieval Politics*, 203

⁶⁹ It seems that Richard had expected the rules to be observed since he sent for hostages and ships, i.e. he expected to be freed as soon as sufficient hostages had arrived. Howden, *Chronica*, iii. 205–6.

⁷⁰ Diceto, *Opera*, ii. 110. His date for the assembly is an obvious slip.

⁷¹ *Regesta Imperii*, nos. 303–4.

⁷² *Chronica*, iii. 215–16. Not surprisingly Dean Ralph called Henry a usurer. Diceto, *Opera*, ii. 110.

Article

make him agree to these revised terms? One possibility is that he was made to endure harsh prison conditions. According to Gilbert of Mons, the former chancellor of Count Baldwin of Hainault and Flanders, when Duke Leopold had handed Richard to the emperor, it had been 'on condition he would suffer no harm to his body'.⁷³ Henry already had a reputation for ferocity. The murder of the bishop of Liège by German knights in November 1192 was widely thought to have been his doing.⁷⁴ Although there is no doubt that both Leopold and Henry needed to keep Richard alive and well enough to be ransomed, he could, of course, have been made very uncomfortable.⁷⁵

According to William of Newburgh, Richard himself later said that out of respect for his royal person he had at first been treated well, and guarded with the appropriate honour, but that after the French king's cousin, Philip of Beauvais, came to the imperial court, he was loaded down with chains so heavy that a horse or a donkey would have struggled to move.⁷⁶ In a letter which Peter of Blois wrote to Archbishop Conrad of Mainz (they had been students together), he complained that Richard was held in chains and made to go hungry, his face pale and body weak.⁷⁷ If anything like this did happen, it is likely to have been in the weeks immediately after Easter 1193 when he was imprisoned in the castle of Trifels near Annweiler in the hills west of Speyer. He evidently did not enjoy his stay on the Trifels. In a letter to his mother, Eleanor, and to the min-

⁷³ Gislebert of Mons, *Chronicon Hanoniense*, ed. L. Vanderkindere (Brussels, 1904), c. 198; English translation by Laura Napran, Gilbert of Mons, *Chronicle of Hainaut* (Woodbridge, 2005). The text of the treaty of Feb. 1193 between Leopold and Henry states that it was 'super incolumitate et pace regis Anglorum'. Chroust (ed.), *Historia de expeditione*, 103.

⁷⁴ Gislebert, *Chronicon Hanoniense*, cc. 193-4, 200; *Chronik Ottos und Marbacher Annalen*, 186. R. H. Schmandt, 'The Election and Assassination of Albert of Louvain, Bishop of Liège 1191-2', *Speculum* 42 (1967), 639-60, 653-5.

⁷⁵ Matthew Strickland, *War and Chivalry: The Conduct and Perception of War in England and Normandy, 1066-1217* (Cambridge, 1996), 197-9.

⁷⁶ Newburgh, *Historia*, ii. 493-4. Cf. Coggeshall, *Chronicon*, 58; Gervase of Canterbury, *Opera Historica*, i. 516.

⁷⁷ Peter Acht (ed.), *Mainzer Urkundenbuch*, ii. pt. 2 (Darmstadt, 1971) no. 573; Görlich, 'Verletzte Ehre', 76-8, 89.

isters who were governing England in his absence, written on 19 April, he reported that his chancellor, William Longchamp, had been able to negotiate a move from the Trifels to Hagenau, where he was now being treated with honour (*honorifice*).⁷⁸ The chancellor's friend, Dean Ralph of London, also reported that Richard was held in the Trifels. He described it as a prison for enemies of the empire who had been condemned to life imprisonment and said that being sent there was meant to frighten Richard into agreeing to an excessive ransom.⁷⁹ Undoubtedly Trifels was one of Henry VI's most secure strongholds. According to Otto of St Blasien, after Henry conquered Sicily he blinded the leaders of the Sicilian opposition, Admiral Margarit and Count Richard, and sent them as prisoners to Trifels. Otto called Trifels the treasure chamber of the state (*erarium publicum confertissimum*) and reported that the gold and silver removed from Sicily was stored there. The Marbach annalist noted an apparently trivial detail: Henry set out from Trifels when he began the march south that led to the conquest of Sicily.⁸⁰ Trifels, where for a while the imperial insignia were to be stored, was evidently already a name to conjure with.⁸¹ Despite this no contemporary German source mentioned Trifels in connection with Richard's captivity.⁸²

A source of great pressure on Richard was the possibility of a deal between the emperor and the king of France. If Richard did not agree to Henry's demands, then the latter might be persuaded either to sell him to Philip or to keep him in prison for longer while the Capetian, assisted by Richard's brother, John, pressed on with his invasion of Normandy. But neither German nor French sources, only English

⁷⁸ The text of the letter survives only thanks to Howden, *Chronica*, iii. 208–10.

⁷⁹ Diceto, *Opera*, ii. 107

⁸⁰ *Chronik Ottos und Marbacher Annalen*, 116, 118, 124, 188. Cf. Chroust (ed.), *Historia de expeditione*, 110.

⁸¹ The association of Trifels with the medieval German Empire led to the castle's re-building in 1938–47. H. Seebach, 'Der Trifels – eine deutsche Burg', *Beiträge zur Trifelsgeschichte*, 3 (2001).

⁸² In saying that Richard was taken in chains to Worms, where the king can be shown to have been for much of the summer of 1193, Otto of St Blasien was the only German chronicler to name a place where he was held captive by Henry VI. *Chronik Ottos und Marbacher Annalen*, 110–12. See the convenient list of places and dates in Mayer, 'A Ghost Ship', 137–8.

Article

ones, had anything to say about contacts between Henry VI and Philip of France. According to Howden, the emperor was attracted by the idea of an alliance with Philip so that he could cope all the better with the rebellion which had been triggered by his involvement in the murder of Bishop Albert of Liège.⁸³ Hence it was in Richard's interest to bring about a peace between Henry and the rebels, and it may well have been his agreement to meet the emperor's raised ransom demands that led to Henry, in his turn, acceding to the demands made by those rebels whose territories in the Lower Rhineland lay across the route along which the ransom money would have to pass.⁸⁴ At any rate the emperor and the rebels from the Rhineland were reconciled in June 1193, perhaps by 8 June.⁸⁵ The terms of their agreement were then made public at Koblenz.⁸⁶ Contemporary comment indicates that the terms were thought to favour the rebels from the Rhineland.⁸⁷ The terms amounted to a defeat for Count Baldwin of Flanders, and the reticence of his chancellor on the subject is noticeable; the best he could do was criticize his lord's regional rivals for their abandonment of confederates, presumably chiefly the dukes

⁸³ Howden, *Chronica*, iii. 214. He had an accurate list of the principal rebels: the archbishops of Cologne and Mainz, and the dukes of Limburg, Saxony, and Brabant (Louvain), the last being, as he knew, the brother of the murdered bishop.

⁸⁴ Gilbert of Mons, *Chronicon*, c. 202.

⁸⁵ In a letter written on that day Richard was evidently more at ease than he had been on 28 May when he had protested – surely too much – that letters in which he expressed his wish to have Savaric, bishop of Bath, chosen as archbishop of Canterbury had been written *pura conscientia et bona voluntate*. *Epistolae Cantuarienses*, 364. Tellingly, on 8 June he wrote: 'You know that while we are in custody it is sometimes useful to give way to the demands of great men and appear to recommend people whom in reality we have no desire to promote.' Gervase of Canterbury, *Opera Historica*, i. 517–18. On this see Kessler, *Richard I. Löwenherz*, 273–4.

⁸⁶ *Vita Alberti*, MGH SS 25, 168. An imperial charter was issued at Koblenz on 14 June, *Regesta Imperii*, no. 302, but in the absence of other dating evidence there is no knowing where Henry was for almost the whole month.

⁸⁷ *Vita Alberti*, 168; Howden, *Chronica*, iii. 214; Andreas von Marchiennes, *Continuatio Aquicineta*, MGH SS 6, 430. Peter Csendes, *Heinrich VI*. (Darmstadt, 1993), 140–1, gives a good summary of the emperor's concessions, passed over rather too lightly in some recent scholarship on Henry VI.

of Saxony and Bohemia.⁸⁸ Roger of Howden gave the credit for this peace-making to Richard; William of Newburgh to 'wise men'.⁸⁹ Immediately after this reconciliation the meeting between Henry VI and Philip II, planned for 25 June, was called off. Instead emperor, king of England, and German princes, among them, as noted by Roger of Howden, the dukes of Louvain and Limburg, assembled at Worms. On 29 June a written agreement (*forma compositionis*) was made between Henry and Richard, and was sworn to by the bishops, dukes, counts, and all the nobles present.⁹⁰

After the treaty of June 1193 all went smoothly for six months. Richard began to issue charters again.⁹¹ German envoys came to London to check the weight and fineness of the silver, and the transport arrangements. On 20 December 1193 Henry VI, *per consilium principum imperii sui*, wrote to the English, announcing that Richard would be released on 17 January 1194 at either Speyer or Worms. For the text of his letter we are, once again, dependent on Howden.⁹² Richard's mother travelled to Germany to be at the great court which would assemble to witness the ceremonial arranged for her son's release. By Epiphany she was at Cologne. But then Henry VI changed his mind. The assembly was postponed. King Philip of France and Prince John had written to Henry, making him a new offer. They would pay him 150,000 marks if he kept Richard for another twelve months, or £1,000 for every month he held him. Eventually Henry and Richard met on 2 February at Mainz, at the fourth of my assemblies, where Henry showed Richard their letters. Having read them,

⁸⁸ Giselbert of Mons, *Chronicon*, c. 200. Henry VI was doubtless pleased to be able to separate the dukes of Saxony and Bohemia from the Rhineland princes, but Schmale's translation of 'sedavit' in the Marbach annalist's phrase 'quam sedicionem imperator contra omnium opinionem facillime sedavit' as 'schlug nieder' gives a misleading impression of rebellion forcibly overcome by a victorious emperor. *Chronik Ottos und Marbacher Annalen*, 186-7.

⁸⁹ Howden, *Chronica*, iii. 214; Newburgh, *Historia*, i. 397-8. See Gillingham, 'William of Newburgh and Henry VI', 67.

⁹⁰ Howden, *Chronica*, iii. 214-15, naming the dukes of Louvain and Limburg as present, as confirmed by *Regesta Imperii*, no. 303. Cf. 'praestitum est ab episcopis et ducibus et comitibus iuramentum', Coggeshall, *Chronicon*, 60.

⁹¹ Gillingham, 'William of Newburgh and Henry VI', 66.

⁹² Howden, *Chronica*, iii. 225-7.

Article

wrote Howden, Richard was disturbed, despairing that he would ever be freed. But fortunately the magnates of the empire who had been the guarantors of earlier treaties—Roger listed ten of them—were able to persuade the emperor to reject the advances made by Philip and John.⁹³ Walter of Coutances, archbishop of Rouen, who was there, wrote to Dean Ralph about ‘anxious and difficult discussions’, and about the parts played by the archbishops of Mainz and Cologne in bringing matters to a conclusion.⁹⁴ All these things were reported in English chronicles, none of them in German chronicles. Why this silence about Henry’s dealings with Richard? Were they not interested? Did they not know?

Before suggesting answers to these questions, I would like to draw attention to another silence, this time the silence of the English. No sooner had the king of England been released on 4 February than, as a free man, he became the emperor’s man for all his dominions, England included. Two German authors, the Marbach annalist and an annalist from Salzburg, described this act of homage.⁹⁵ So also did one English author, Roger of Howden. Roger’s report is worth a closer look.

So that he might escape from captivity, and on his mother’s advice, Richard resigned the kingdom of England, and granted it to the emperor as to the lord of all men, using his cap to invest him with it; but the emperor, as had been pre-arranged, in the sight of the magnates of Germany and England immediately restored it to him, to be held in return for an annual tribute of £5,000, investing him with a double cross of gold.

⁹³ Ibid. iii. 229, 231–2. Roger’s list of German magnates included four who witnessed imperial charters a few days earlier at Würzburg, *Regesta Imperii*, nos. 331–2.

⁹⁴ Diceto, *Opera*, ii. 112–13.

⁹⁵ ‘Ipse liber et absolutus absque omni coactione homo factus est imperii Romani, tota terra sua Anglia et aliis terris propriis imperatori datis et ab eo in beneficio receptis.’ *Chronik Ottos und Marbacher Annalen*, 186; ‘terram propriam, quam paternis viribus expugnatam in proprietate tenebat, imperatori tradidit et a manu imperatoris sceptro investitus suscepit’, *Annales Salisburgensium Additamentum*, MGH SS 13, 240. Roger’s list of German princes at Mainz included the archbishop of Salzburg. Howden, *Chronica*, iii. 232.

A classic piece of assembly political theatre – lots of Symbolic spoken, according to a pre-arranged script, and in the sight of a big audience. But Roger's account contains one more sentence. 'The emperor on his deathbed released Richard and his heirs from this and all other agreements.'⁹⁶ As these words show, Roger wrote this after he knew of Henry's death in September 1197. As it happens, we know a great deal about Roger's working method. He wrote up his account of each year soon after the year's end. But he always left a few leaves blank between the end of one year and the start of the next so that he could enter any information that came to him later.⁹⁷ Given how very well-informed Roger was, we can be sure he knew about the ceremony at Mainz in February 1194, but chose to remain silent about it. Only after Henry had died could he bring himself to mention it. Curiously he then entered his narrative of Richard's grant of England to the emperor, not under the year 1194, when it happened, but as the last item in 1192.⁹⁸ By implication, by late 1197 he had no space left in his working copy at the end of his entries for 1193 and 1194. Roger was the only contemporary English writer ever to mention the homage, not Ralph of Coggeshall, not Gervase of Canterbury, not William of Newburgh, not Ralph of Diceto. The dean of London did, however, allude to it. While writing about Richard's release, he referred to something happening that was 'the result of disgraceful pressure, bad, illegal, contrary to canon law, contrary to good custom, illegitimate, null and void'.⁹⁹ He did not say what this disgraceful act was, but he evidently felt very strongly about it.

Historians and others have long felt that for Richard this was a great humiliation, for the emperor a great triumph. Some have felt that it reflected Henry's alleged dream of ruling the world.¹⁰⁰ Kate

⁹⁶ Ibid. iii. 202-3.

⁹⁷ John Gillingham, 'Roger of Howden on Crusade', in P. M. Holt (ed.), *Medieval Historical Writing in the Christian and Islamic Worlds* (London, 1982), repr. in John Gillingham, *Richard Coeur de Lion* (London, 1994), 141-54, at 144-5; D. Corner, 'The *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi* and *Chronica* of Roger, Parson of Howden', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 56 (1983), 126-44, at 132-4.

⁹⁸ In this way misleading many subsequent historians.

⁹⁹ Diceto, *Opera*, ii. 113.

¹⁰⁰ One of the illustrations to the *Liber ad honorem Augusti* lists twenty-four

Article

Norgate, for example, whose first book had been published in 1887, wrote in 1924 that Henry VI had been 'obsessed, more strongly perhaps than any other German ruler before our own day, by the German dream of world dominion'.¹⁰¹ In her short story 'Richard Löwenherz auf dem Trifels', published in 1941, Juliana von Stockhausen wrote: 'Angezogen von der Gewalt des Reiches schwamm die britannische Insel, ein armseliger Fisch, in das deutsche Imperium ein' (Attracted by the power of the empire, the British isles, that pitiful fish, swam into the German imperium).¹⁰² A few years later Günther Bullinger argued that doing homage to Henry actually suited Richard's interests. By accepting his homage, so the argument runs, the emperor recognized Richard as the rightful ruler, something that mattered to Richard because King Philip of France had recognized John as the legitimate ruler. Hence this piece of Symbolic theatre was staged at Richard's initiative, or possibly at his mother's.¹⁰³ Since then there have been two interpretations of Richard's homage. Either Bullinger's line has been accepted,¹⁰⁴ or it has been written off as 'inhaltsleere Form, ohne jede reale Bedeutung' (a form devoid of content, lacking any real significance),¹⁰⁵ indeed so lacking in importance that Ralph Turner and Richard Heiser do not even mention it in their study of Richard's reign.¹⁰⁶

But the silence of the contemporary English chroniclers suggests to me that the old-fashioned interpretation may well be the right one, though this old one also fits in well with the recent emphasis by historians such as Tim, Gerd Althoff, and Knut Görich, upon the central significance of honour and reputation, and hence also of the acts and the gestures by which rulers maintained their honour and reputa-

lands as subject to the emperor's authority, among them *Anglia*. Kölzer and Stähli, *Petrus de Ebulo*, 230-1.

¹⁰¹ Kate Norgate, *Richard the Lion Heart* (London, 1924), 272.

¹⁰² Juliana von Stockhausen, *Die Nacht von Wimpfen* (Strasburg, 1941), 60. For his generous gift of a copy of this I am much indebted to Hans Reither.

¹⁰³ Bullinger, 'König Richard', 134-41.

¹⁰⁴ van Eickels, *Vom inszenierten Konsens*, 327-9.

¹⁰⁵ Sigrid Hauser, *Staufische Lehnspolitik am Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt am Main, 1998), 243-5, as cited in Görich, 'Verletzte Ehre', 86.

¹⁰⁶ Ralph V. Turner and Richard R. Heiser, *The Reign of Richard Lionheart* (Harlow, 2000), 44, 227, 229-30.

tion.¹⁰⁷ After all, their reputation resided in the opinions of others. As David Hume put it in the opening words of his essay 'Of the First Principles of Government' (1741): 'Nothing appears more surprising to those who consider human affairs with a philosophical eye, than the easiness with which the many are governed by the few; . . . when we enquire by what means this wonder is effected we shall find that . . . [t]he governors have nothing to support them but opinion.'¹⁰⁸ In the opinion of English chroniclers, including men as close to the centre of government as Roger of Howden and Ralph of Diceto, doing homage to the emperor damaged Richard's honour and reputation. It added to the *contumelia captivonis* which persuaded him to agree to a confirmatory coronation, 'eine Befestigungskrönung', after his return to England.¹⁰⁹ But the attitude of the English chroniclers, their silences and Dean Ralph's indignation, suggests to me that it was not just the king's honour that had suffered. In April 1193 Henry VI had written to the English, addressing his letter to the 'archbishops, bishops, earls, barons, nobles and everyone in England to whom this comes'. In this letter he had promised that he would always act for the honour and profit of Richard's loyal subjects (*ad devotorum suorum et fidelium honorem et profectum*).¹¹⁰ Evidently it was not just individuals, kings and others, who could possess honour; so, too, could a people, in this case the English people, and possessing it, they could also lose it.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁷ 'The symbolic and ritualised forms of interaction did not give expression to an underlying reality: they *were* that reality.' Reuter, *Medieval Politics*, 189. Cf. Trautz, *Die Könige von England*, 88–9.

¹⁰⁸ 'It is therefore on opinion only that government is founded; and this maxim applies to the most despotic and most military governments as well as to the most free and most popular.' David Hume, *Essays: Moral, Political and Literary*, ed. E. F. Miller (Indianapolis, 1985), 32.

¹⁰⁹ Gervase of Canterbury, *Opera Historica*, i. 526.

¹¹⁰ Howden, *Chronica*, iii. 211.

¹¹¹ See Knut Görich, 'Die Ehre des Reiches (*honor imperii*): Überlegungen zu einem Forschungsproblem', in Johannes Laudage and Yvonne Leiverkus (eds.), *Rittertum und höfische Kultur der Stauferzeit* (Cologne, 2006), 36–74, esp. 67–74, describing the Reich as 'von einer Personengemeinschaft gebildet und getragen, für deren Handeln der *honor* eine entscheidende Richtschnur war'.

Article

It is in light of this English silence that I return to the silence of German chroniclers on the subject of the emperor's dealings with Richard from the moment he had him in his power until the moment at which he set him free in February 1194, at which point two of them, the Marbach and Salzburg annalists, evidently felt gratified that Richard had done homage for England. In 1193 Henry did make attempts, as we can see from English narratives, to justify his charge that Richard was the 'enemy of the empire', but no contemporary German chronicler reported these attempts, not even (except indirectly in his entry for 1190) the Marbach annalist. Of the authors writing within the newly expanded empire, only Peter of Eboli described a meeting between Henry and Richard, and he did so in extraordinarily misleading terms. So far as I can see, all modern German historians of Henry's reign are silent on the subject of the silence of German contemporaries. They note that English authors condemned Henry – what a surprise! – but they say nothing about what German authors thought, no doubt on the straightforward assumption that since they said nothing, there is nothing that can be said. But this means they tend to give the impression that Henry's fellow Germans tacitly approved of his treatment of the crusader-king.

It strikes me that in the early 1190s the crusade was a difficult subject for these German chroniclers. On the one hand they were immensely interested in it; on the other, for German participants, from Barbarossa downwards, it all went wrong. If only Frederick Barbarossa and his son, Duke Frederick of Swabia, had not both died on the way to the Holy Land, wrote Otto of St Blasien, then the crusade would have succeeded, thanks above all to the strength and courage of Germany.¹¹² When a chronicler from Cologne referred to the dishonour Leopold had suffered at the siege of Acre, he associated the whole German people with that act, explaining that Richard always doubted the valour of Germans.¹¹³ There was wounded national pride here, and the belief that Richard, who played the dominating role on crusade, was very largely to blame. When Acre fell, wrote Otto, Richard arrogantly claimed all the credit for himself.

¹¹² Both Otto and the Marbach annalist did their best to make the German contribution to the siege of Acre a significant one. *Chronik Ottos und Marbacher Annalen*, 100–4, 184.

¹¹³ *Chronica Regia Coloniensis*, 154.

Because his armed forces were greater than everyone else's he despised all the other princes, and insulted Duke Leopold. Hence, in the end, the Germans left the crusade hating English perfidy (*anglicam perfidiam*) and refusing to be subject to the English.¹¹⁴ Similar ideas were expressed by Ansbert, Magnus of Reichersberg and by some anonymous annalists.¹¹⁵ On the one hand then, the king of England had it coming to him; on the other to treat a crusader-pilgrim in the way Richard was treated in Germany was sacrilege. In this dilemma, silence was a way out.

The contrasts in the ways Duke Leopold and Emperor Henry were portrayed by non-Germans are thought-provoking. For example, Rigord of St Denis, author of the deeds of Philip Augustus, reported how Richard humiliated Leopold at Acre, throwing his banner into a deep cesspit. He gave the dramatic story of Richard's shipwreck, his flight through the Alps, his capture by Leopold and the handover to the emperor—all without any judgemental comment. But he then said that the emperor unjustly (*injuste*) held Richard in prison for almost a year and a half.¹¹⁶ An annalist of St Aubin, Angers, said nothing at all about Leopold, but wrote that the emperor of Germany acted 'against God and justice'.¹¹⁷ Or consider William of Newburgh's judgements. He condemned Leopold, referring to the 'noble king being captured by the wicked duke'. But these few words are little indeed compared with what he had to say about Henry: a whole page of condemnation, the emperor depraved by avarice, defiling the *imperium romanum*, to Christians a much worse enemy than Saladin.¹¹⁸ What makes this comparison of opinions about

¹¹⁴ *Chronik Ottos und Marbacher Annalen*, 104–6.

¹¹⁵ 'rex Anglie primus et precipuus in tota militia christiana, eo quod in facultatibus et in omnibus opibus alios precedebat et eos aspernatus postponabat, dominium super omnes usurpabat', Chroust (ed.), *Historia de expeditione*, 98. For a similar impression of Richard at Acre, *Chronicon Magni*, 520. Cf. 'Erat enim idem rex erga Teutonicos arrogans et in multis iniuriosus', *Annales Egmundani*, MGH SS 16, 471.

¹¹⁶ Rigord, *Histoire de Philippe Auguste*, 308, 314–16.

¹¹⁷ 'on the advice, it is believed, of the king of France', L. Halphen (ed.), *Recueil d'Annales angevines* (Paris, 1903), 26.

¹¹⁸ Newburgh, *Historia*, i. 383, 387. As Rudolf Jahncke observed in what is still one of the best studies of William in any language, he 'vertritt weniger einen einseitigen englischen, als einen allgemein christlich-sittlichen Stand-

Article

Leopold and Henry particularly striking is that Leopold was excommunicated by the pope, but Henry was not.¹¹⁹ It was not primarily the pope who set the standards by which these authors, all of them churchmen of one sort or another, judged political actions. Other standards mattered more, and by these other standards Leopold's conduct was defensible, as the English acknowledged, even if only reluctantly.¹²⁰ Henry VI's conduct, however, was indefensible. He may have been tempted to break the rules of the game at the *Hoftag* in Regensburg in January 1193; he broke them immediately after the assembly of Speyer two months later; and he did so again in January 1194. Something of the atmosphere at Mainz in February 1194 is conveyed by one who was there, Archbishop Walter of Rouen, in the letter telling the dean of London that the king had been released 'post multas anxietates et labores'. According to Roger of Howden and William of Newburgh, only the plain speaking of the assembled princes of the empire brought Henry at last to the point of setting Richard free. In William of Newburgh's version, they told the emperor that if he did not keep the agreement of which they were guarantors, 'it would bring an inexpiable stain upon the empire's honour (*imperiali honestati*)'.¹²¹ Whether or not anything quite like this was ever said to Henry's face, it seems clear that he was already regarded as capable of conduct that dishonoured the empire by his treatment of Tusculum in 1191, 'imperium . . . non mediocriter dehones-

punkt. Denn urteilt der Chronist nach demselben streng sittlichen Maßstab auch über die Könige des eigenen Landes, ja sogar über die Glieder der Kirche selbst'. Rudolf Jahncke, *Guilelmus Neubrigensis: Ein pragmatischer Geschichtsschreiber des zwölften Jahrhunderts* (Jena, 1912), 121-2.

¹¹⁹ On Leopold's excommunication see Ashcroft, 'Der Minnesänger', 225-6. It is commonly said that Pope Celestine refused to allow Henry a Christian burial because he had been regarded as an excommunicate ever since the capture of Richard, e.g. Csendes, *Heinrich VI.*, 193. I have not yet managed to find the evidence for this.

¹²⁰ Indeed, by the time Matthew Paris told the story of Richard and Leopold at Acre it was in a version entirely favourable to the duke. Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ed. H. R. Luard, 7 vols. (RS, 1872-83), ii. 384-5.

¹²¹ Diceto, *Opera*, ii. 112-13; Howden, *Chronica*, iii. 232; Newburgh, *Historia*, i. 403.

tavit'.¹²² One German prince who certainly seems to have felt this way, given his record of consistent opposition to the emperor's plans in 1195–6, was Adolf of Altena, archbishop of Cologne. Hence his decision when Richard, free at last, attended mass in Cologne cathedral in February 1194, to put off his archiepiscopal majesty and take on the office of *precentor*, leading the introit of the feast *Ad Vincula Sancti Petri* (1 August): 'Now I know that God has sent his angel and taken me from the hand of Herod.'¹²³

Henry made a huge profit out of keeping Richard so long in captivity, but at some cost. His dealings with the king of England reinforced his reputation as a ruler who was ready to jettison conventional political morality whenever he thought he might gain advantage by doing so. According to the chronicle of Reinhardsbrunn, when only a few princes attended a court at Mainz in March 1196, they were told they had either to give their free consent to the scheme of making the kingdom hereditary, or they would find themselves *in custodia publica* as prisoners of the empire. At first Henry believed that by such methods he had got his way, but in the face of continuing princely resistance, he eventually dropped the plan.¹²⁴ He had earlier suffered a similar setback. By adopting the tactic of approaching the princes one by one, he persuaded almost all of them – though not the archbishop of Cologne – to promise to elect his son Frederick as king. But when they came to the assembly to which they had been summoned, they did not do what they had promised.¹²⁵ This is the first known case of a refusal to elect the son of a reigning ruler.¹²⁶ Although Henry, after dropping his *Erbreichsplan*, was subsequently able to secure Frederick's election as his successor, the episode is symptomatic of the distrust with which he was regarded by princes as well as by the pope.

¹²² *Chronik Ottos und Marbacher Annalen*, 94. On the assumption that in this statement Otto of St Blasien was reflecting earlier opinion.

¹²³ Diceto, *Opera*, ii. 114; Howden, *Chronica*, iii. 235.

¹²⁴ *Chronica Reinhardsbrunnensis*, MGH SS 30, 556, 558; *Chronik Ottos und Marbacher Annalen*, 196.

¹²⁵ *Marbacher Annalen*, 194. This was probably the assembly which met at Worms in early Dec. 1195.

¹²⁶ Ulrich Schmidt, *Königswahl und Thronfolge im 12. Jahrhundert* (Cologne, 1987), 229.

Article

In his essay on Assembly Politics, Tim Reuter regretted that, on the basis of the relative richness of accounts of trials and meetings in Anglo-Norman and Angevin England, there had not hitherto been more analyses of how assemblies operated, including less well-recorded assemblies from other regions and periods.¹²⁷ I certainly cannot claim that this paper has met his wish. On the other hand, the accounts of the remarkably well-informed chroniclers of Angevin England, authors such as Roger of Howden, William of Newburgh and Ralph of Diceto, both what they said and what they did not say about the German assemblies of 1193–4, do allow us to gain a better understanding of the silences of their German contemporaries. Not even understandable irritation at what they saw as the king of England's arrogance and his part in the misfortunes that dogged the German contribution to the Third Crusade could bring them to write anything at all about Henry VI's dealings with Richard at the assemblies of Speyer and Worms in 1193.

¹²⁷ Reuter, *Medieval Politics*, 200.

JOHN GILLINGHAM is a Fellow of the British Academy and Professor Emeritus at the London School of Economics. He is the author of numerous books and articles on English history in the high Middle Ages. His biography of Richard I was published in the series *Yale English Monarchs* in 1999.

REVIEW ARTICLE

SITUATING GERMAN ORIENTALIST SCHOLARSHIP: EDWARD SAID, ORIENTALISM, AND THE GERMAN PREDICAMENT

Indra Sengupta

TODD KONTJE, *German Orientalisms* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004), x + 316 pp. ISBN 0 472 11392 5. \$35.00

LEE M. ROBERTS (ed.), *Germany and the Imagined East* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2005), xvi + 203 pp. ISBN 1 904303 61 7. £34.99 \$69.99

SABINE MANGOLD, *Eine 'weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft': Die deutsche Orientalistik im 19. Jahrhundert*, Pallas Athene, Beiträge zur Universitäts- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte, 11 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2004), 330 pp. ISBN 3 515 08515 7. EUR 60.00

Since the late 1970s a growing field of inquiry within studies of colonialism has been trying to locate Germany's role in strengthening the cultural hegemony of European imperialism in Asia and Africa. One important example of this research trend is the debate about German scholarship on the 'Orient' and its relationship to (colonial) structures of knowledge and power that was started off by the publication of Edward Said's *Orientalism* in 1978. Much of the debate about European scholarship on Asia and the 'East' has predictably focused on British and French scholarship, with Germany by virtue of its late entry into the scramble for colonies and the consequently small size of its empire drawing comparatively less interest. Nevertheless, by the mid 1990s attention focused increasingly on what came to be known as 'German Orientalism'. The three books under review, two monographs and one collection of essays, mark a significant contribution to this field of research.

Review Article

Orientalism, Colonialism and the German Case

Over the past three decades, research on colonialism has been greatly influenced by cultural theory and has increasingly focused on the cultural dimensions of colonialism. Crucial to this shift in colonial studies was the influence of the thesis postulated by the American cultural theorist Edward Said, primarily in his two works *Orientalism* (1978) and *Culture and Imperialism* (1988). In the first Said drew on the Foucauldian notion of discourse and the Gramscian idea of cultural hegemony operating within civil society to develop a knowledge-power mode of analysis to understand what he described as the West's hegemony over the Orient. Orientalism, in Said's view, is 'a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between "the Orient" and (most of the time) "the Occident"'.¹ Said asserted that Western scholarship on the Orient has been intimately linked to Western political power over the Orient, especially in the age of European colonialism. Orientalism, according to Said, 'can be discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient—dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient'.² It is 'the ensemble of relationships between works, audiences and some particular aspects of the Orient' which 'constitutes an analyzable formation . . . whose presence in time, in discourse, in institutions . . . gives it its strength and authority'.³ In this sense, European scholarship on the Orient, by carrying within it the authority of 'superior' knowledge, became a collaborator in the hegemonizing project of colonialism. Of course, Said was not the first scholar to write on Europe's cultural relations with the East, a subject that has long been a favourite, mainly with scholars of Oriental studies trying to trace the intellectual and cultural origins of their discipline, and literary historians keen to problematize European literature's fascination with Eastern cultures.⁴ However, it was Said's analytical framework of (Western,

¹ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London, 1995), 2.

² Ibid. 3.

³ Ibid. 20

⁴ See e.g. Benita Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries: Studies on India in the British Imagination 1880–1930* (Berkeley, 1972; repr. 1998). A ground-breaking work

hegemonic) knowledge and (European, imperial) power and the weight attached to what he described as a hegemonic discourse on the Orient that gave a fresh angle to approaching colonialism as a cultural phenomenon and provided a significant impetus to post-colonial studies.

As has been remarked, Said was essentially concerned with Orientalism in the context of European colonialism and therefore drew his examples mainly from the history of the British and French empires from the eighteenth century onwards. Hence he only cursorily dealt with German Oriental scholarship, defending his decision with the fairly obvious argument that despite the 'great scientific prestige that accrued to German scholarship by the middle of the nineteenth century', German national interest was in no way involved in the pursuit of Oriental studies in Germany:

At no time in German scholarship during the first two-thirds of the nineteenth century could a close partnership have developed between Orientalists and a protracted, sustained *national* interest in the Orient. There was nothing in Germany to correspond to the Anglo-French presence in India, the Levant, North Africa. Moreover, the German Orient was almost exclusively a scholarly, or at least a classical, Orient: it was made the subject of lyrics, fantasies, and even novels, but it was never actual . . . What German Oriental scholarship did was to refine and elaborate techniques whose application was to texts, myths, ideas, and languages almost literally gathered from the Orient by imperial Britain and France.⁵

Further, Said argued, 'the sheer quality, consistency, and mass of British, French and American writing on the Orient' distinguished the Orientalism of these countries from that of other European nations, including Germany.⁶

on Europe's engagement with the East that in many ways pre-empted Said's arguments, but came to be overshadowed by *Orientalism*, was Raymond Schwab's *magnum opus*, written in the 1950s. See Raymond Schwab, *The Oriental Renaissance: Europe's Rediscovery of India and the East, 1680-1880* (New York, 1984; 1st pub. in French, 1950).

⁵ Said, *Orientalism*, 18-19.

⁶ *Ibid.* 17.

Review Article

Said's general thesis of Orientalism has long since been criticized, modified, and revised in a long-running debate that has been as much academic as political and ideological.⁷ The intensity that characterized the reception of and subsequent engagement with Said remained until the early 1990s largely confined to post-colonial studies on the British Empire. German Oriental scholarship, significant for its sheer volume and the respect it commanded in British and French academic circles continued, by and large, to be ignored by cultural theorists. Certainly, this was largely the result of Said's own

⁷ The bulk of scholarly engagement with Said's *Orientalism* has come from Middle Eastern and South Asian studies. Some of the main points of criticism of Said's thesis are the following: Said's disinclination to historicize the phenomenon and his consequent willingness to oversimplify complex historical processes by means of theory; his attempt to reduce the whole gamut of relations between Europe and the East to power structures, and all forms of Western scholarship on the East to hegemonic discourses, leaving no room for any other kind of encounter except one based on power relations; and his inability to reflect (self-)critically on the ambivalent position of the critic who himself is situated in Western knowledge systems and structures. While the debate is too vast to be discussed here, some useful insights into Orientalism as a historical process of cultural domination are provided by Bassam Tibi, 'Orient und Okzident: Feindschaft oder interkulturelle Kommunikation? Anmerkungen zur Orientalismus-Debatte', *Neue Politische Literatur*, 29 (1984), 267–86; Bernard Lewis, *Islam and the West* (Oxford, 1993) for the Middle East; Gyan Prakash, 'Orientalism Now', *History and Theory*, 34/3 (Oct. 1995), 199–212; and the early essay by Ronald Inden, 'Orientalist Constructions of India', *Modern Asian Studies*, 20/3 (1986), 401–46 for South Asia. For an early critique of the inherent tensions in Said's thesis of a hegemonic Western scholarship, also written from a South Asian, but Marxist, perspective, see Aijaz Ahmad, 'Between Orientalism and Historicism', *Studies in History*, 7/1 (1991), 135–63. John MacKenzie's work on Orientalism in British culture is a particularly vital contribution to a field of scholarship which has traditionally been treated as a perspective from the 'periphery' and far removed from the metropolitan 'centre' of the British Empire; see John MacKenzie, *Orientalism: History, Theory and the Arts* (Manchester, 1995). A recent long-durée overview of Orientalist scholarship in Europe and the debate surrounding Orientalism can be found in Robert Irwin, *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and their Enemies* (London, 2006).

reticence on the German case. However, this is not to say that German Oriental scholarship, or the place of the East in German literature, did not receive any attention. On the contrary, long before Said German (apolitical) 'interest' in the East had consistently drawn scholarly attention and resulted in a large number of studies ranging from the history of Oriental studies in Germany to representations of the East in German literature.⁸ Further, earlier scholarship had not fought shy of examining the connections between German interest in the East and the formulation of anti-Semitic racial theories at home, as, for example, in the work of Léon Poliakov.⁹ However, since the early 1990s, and parallel to a rise in interest in the practice and ideology of German colonialism—a subject that, by virtue of its relative insignificance compared to the French and British cases, had largely been ignored in scholarship—there has been considerable interest in conceptualizing German Orientalism within the Saidian analytical framework. Much of the writing on German Orientalism that has emerged since has been the work of scholars of Oriental studies, Germanists, literary theorists, and literary historians, but also cultural historians.¹⁰ It is in the context of this new literature on German

⁸ See e. g. Theodor Benfey, *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft und orientalischen Philologie in Deutschland seit dem Anfang des 19. Jahrhunderts mit einem Rückblick auf die früheren Zeiten* (Munich, 1869); or Johann Fück, *Die arabischen Studien in Europa bis in den Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1955) for the history of Oriental studies in Germany. For studies of representations of the East in German literature, see e. g. Ernst Behler, 'Das Indienbild der deutschen Romantik', *Germanisch-Romanische Monatschrift*, 49 (1968), 21–37.

⁹ Léon Poliakov, *The Aryan Myth: A History of Racist and Nationalist Ideas in Europe* (London, 1974).

¹⁰ See e. g. the influential and much-reproduced essay by the Chicago Sanskritist Sheldon Pollock on the links between the products of German Sanskrit scholarship and an inward-looking colonialism, directed at exterminating Jews in the Third Reich. Sheldon Pollock, 'Deep Orientalism? Notes on Sanskrit and Power beyond the Raj', in Carol A. Breckenridge and Peter van der Veer (eds.), *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament: Perspectives on South Asia* (Philadelphia, 1993), 76–133. Also Nina Berman, *Orientalismus, Kolonialismus und Moderne: Zum Bild des Orients in der deutschsprachigen Kultur um 1900* (Stuttgart, 1997); and ead., 'Thoughts on Zionism in the Context of German–Middle Eastern Relations', in Jennifer Jenkins (ed.), *Comparative*

Review Article

Orientalism and its conceptualization in the Saidian framework of power and knowledge that the books under review must be read.

It must be remembered here that Said himself was not unaware of the potential of German Orientalist scholarship for his analysis. He was aware of the force of authority that German scholarship enjoyed, even though it was not directly rooted in any obvious colonial project. Thus he said: 'what German Orientalism had in common with Anglo-French and later American Orientalism was a kind of intellectual authority over the Orient within Western culture. This authority must in large part be the subject of any description of Orientalism.'¹¹ Nevertheless, he himself refused to get drawn into the debate, while repeatedly acknowledging the close links between German and British and French Orientalist scholarship and scholarly networks.

In historical research critiques and modifications of Said's hesitant postulations on German Orientalism have taken two main directions. The first espouses the view that if one isolates the conceptual component of Said's thesis from the historical context of colonialism to which Said attaches such centrality and examines German Orientalism not in a colonial, but a national and nationalist-imperialist context, then it, too, is as much a system of knowledge for political power as the kind of Orientalism that was generated in colonial systems. An early and provocative example of this kind of engagement with Said's omission of the German case is the influential essay by the Chicago Sanskritist Sheldon Pollock on the politics of German Indology that was published in 1993, in which he stressed that the sheer size of state investment in Indology and the 'volume of the production of German orientalist knowledge' meant that 'no serious encounter with Orientalism as it relates to traditional India can avoid the case of Germany'.¹² Conceding that Said's omission of German Oriental scholarship was obviously due to the difficulty of accommodating it 'within an explanatory framework of colonial instrumentality', he went on to argue that it nevertheless exemplified Said's ground-breaking thesis of Orientalism as 'a complex of knowledge and power . . . vectored not outward to the Orient but inward

Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East, 24/2 (2004), 133–44, in which she examines the strong material German interest involved in the Middle East, which in her view provided the context of German Orientalism.

¹¹ Said, *Orientalism*, 19.

¹² Pollock, 'Deep Orientalism?', 82.

to Europe itself'.¹³ Thus, to Pollock, German Indological scholarship was an essential component of the kind of 'scientific' knowledge that provided the Nazi regime with its hegemonic power within the German nation and in Europe, and provided the intellectual authority to exterminate Germany's Jewish population.

This kind of nation-oriented thesis of German Orientalism has recently received renewed attention. The contributors to the special edition of *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* (2004) dedicated to German Orientalism, for example, agree that by breaking the 'connection between Orientalism and European empire' and looking at 'a different set of dynamics', such as 'those between Orientalism, nationalism and imperialism', the German case is perfectly compatible with Said's analysis of the nexus between Western knowledge and colonial power: 'the Orient was the site upon which and through which the German national and imperial visions were articulated and acted upon.'¹⁴ Thus the focus is on Islam, the Ottoman Empire, and Central Asia, all of which were sites of hegemony for German Orientalist scholarship and thus became the stage for enacting Germany's national-imperial ambitions, even in the absence of a formal empire.

The second line of critique of Said in the context of German Orientalism has argued that German Orientalist scholarship, far from being historically disengaged from colonialism, in fact gave colonialism its intellectual force and thus strengthened hegemonic power structures in the Orient, as, for example, in British India. Thus, Rosane Rocher, for example, refers to the significant intellectual

¹³ Ibid. 83.

¹⁴ Jennifer Jenkins, 'German Orientalism: Introduction', *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, 24/2 (2004), 98. See also the article by Tuska Benes in the same volume, in which she locates Central Asia as the site of both the German scholarly interest and national-imperial aspirations. Tuska Benes, 'Comparative Linguistics as Ethnology: In Search of Indo-Germans in Central Asia, 1770-1830', *ibid.* 117-32. The Germanist Kamakshi Murti has shown, with reference to the writings of the Oxford-based German Indologist Max Müller, how German Indologists in the middle and late nineteenth century shared the faith of the British in their moral right to rule India. See Kamakshi P. Murti, *India: The Seductive and Seduced 'Other' of German Orientalism* (Westport, Conn., 2001).

Review Article

authority that accrued to German Indological scholarship in colonial India from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards, which left a deep mark on British educational policy-making in India and was instrumental to the strengthening of cultural colonialism in British India.¹⁵

'Das Land der Mitte': East and West in German Literature

The response to Said from literary studies was much greater and more immediate than the response of German historians. The first two of the books under review can be located in this tradition and they engage with Said's thesis of Orientalism by drawing on German literature. Aware of Said's reticence on German Oriental scholarship, the volume of essays edited by Lee M. Roberts and the monograph by Todd Kontje both attempt to fill the gap in a fuller understanding of Orientalism by focusing on Germany's cultural specificity and its geographical position. The latter, according to the main thesis of both studies, defined the spatial-cultural imagination of German literature. The volumes engage with Orientalism from a literary (Roberts) and a literary-historical (Kontje) perspective respectively and take their inspiration from the topos of the 'land in the middle' in German literary production since the eighteenth century. Both are dedicated to exploring what Kontje describes in his opening sentence as 'the role of symbolic geography in German literature', to understanding how East and West were conceptualized in a literary tradition that saw the German nation, by virtue of its geographical location in central Europe, as situated precisely between the two (in their understanding mutually opposed) cultural entities. But Germany's geographical location itself is less relevant than the spatial imagination of its literary canon. As Kontje explains: 'Because Orientalism has more to do with Western ideology than Eastern geography, the actual location of "the Orient" matters less than the consistency of a certain Orientalizing discourse' (p. 12). These words are strongly remi-

¹⁵ Rosane Rocher, 'British Orientalism in the Eighteenth Century: The Dialectics of Knowledge and Government', in Breckenridge and van der Veer (eds.), *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament*, 215–49.

niscent of Said's own understanding of Orientalism as a process and a system, rather than a physical-spatial concept.¹⁶

However, Kontje's aim is to take the argument of Orientalism further. Using the notion of the 'land in the middle' in texts that, in his view, form the core of Germany's national literary canon, Kontje seeks to do this in two interrelated ways. First, he wishes to open up the concept of Orientalism to more fluidity than Said has allowed in his conceptualization of an essentially hegemonic discourse. Second, he attempts to give what Said has treated as a historically unchanging phenomenon a historical context. Kontje's choice of texts has a scope of epic dimensions, spanning seven centuries from the thirteenth to the twentieth (to Germany post 9/11), and ranges from Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzival* through the works of Herder, Novalis, Goethe, and Thomas Mann to Günter Grass, Emine Sevgi Özdamar, and Michael Roes. The complexity, ambivalence and tensions that quite obviously characterize the hugely varying texts in their construction of symbolic geography also explain the choice of the plural 'Orientalisms' in the title, since texts so far apart from each other both in theme and time can hardly be united by a single, homogeneous discourse on the East. The East itself, as the texts Kontje has chosen indicate, is varied and encompasses, at various points and in various texts, the Ottoman Empire, the Holy Land of the Bible, India, and even the eastern borders of Europe. But then, as has been said before, the geography of this East is irrelevant; Kontje's central concern is its complexity. The Orientalisms of these texts are characterized both by a conservative intolerance of, and an openness towards, the East. The first of these trends 'oscillates between a compensatory Eurocentrism' (the result of a late start in the race for colonies) and 'an anti-Western, anti-Semitic Indo-Germanicism' (p. 8), which had disastrous consequences in the Third Reich. The openness is more elusive to grasp conceptually and Kontje is satisfied to describe its appearance in unexpected places (such as in Herder's openness to cultural difference and Novalis's cosmopolitanism), rather than to theorize about it.

¹⁶ Said's *Orientalism* includes the following programmatic statement in the opening paragraph: 'The Orient was almost a European invention, and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences', *ibid.* 1.

Review Article

Kontje's work is a rich contribution to the field of study of German Orientalism, covering as it does a vast range of the canonical works of German literature and discussing them in the analytical framework of Orientalism. The strength of the work lies in the detailed reading of the texts and the willingness to engage with Said with the help of cultural theory after Said. In an age when the study of literature appears to be buckling under the impact of cultural studies, Kontje pleads for a re-reading of the history of national literatures, but 'from today's decentered, diasporic, postcolonial perspective' without compromising the place for literary imagination (p. 244). This is evident in the last chapter and conclusion of the book, in which Kontje draws upon post-colonial theory on migration and diasporas to show the shift in symbolic geography that is taking place in parts of modern German literature. As the movement of groups and individuals in a globalized world has become easier, so, too, are the boundaries between East and West becoming increasingly fuzzy and the notion of place increasingly unstable. Emine Sevgi Özdamar's *Das Leben ist eine Karawanserei* and *Die Brücke vom Goldenen Horn* and Michael Roes's *Leeres Viertel, Rub' Al-Khali: Invention über das Spiel* are used as examples of such clouded boundaries and shifting places.

Notwithstanding the richness and breadth of the book, some questions remain less than adequately answered. While Kontje's attempt to reconcile a traditional reading of the history of literature with cultural theory is commendable, the engagement with the theoretical assumptions of Said's Orientalism is fairly superficial. The point about the need to accommodate the unexpected and the inexplicable in cultural theory and the place of literary imagination that uncomfortably lends itself to theorizing is well worth emphasizing, but where does that leave Said's thesis of a hegemonic Western discourse? The book touches on the question, but fleetingly. Similarly, for a work that is dedicated to reading canonical texts in a historical perspective, there is little evidence of context. For all Kontje's protestations of the need to provide a historical context for Orientalism in German literature, this is exactly where the book falls short. In fact, in this respect, Kontje's greatest strength—his detailed engagement with the text—turns out to be his shortcoming. Within what structures were the texts that Kontje deals with in such detail produced, and how do the texts relate to them? Further, Kontje's Orientalisms appear to

remain static and unchangeable throughout the seven hundred years in which they were produced. Surely, when trying to accommodate a vast span of time within the same analytical framework, one has to be particularly careful about changing contexts. Otherwise it is difficult to escape precisely the charge of ahistoricity that has been levelled at Said himself. These are certainly the reservations of a historian, but there is no denying that the volume would have gained further nuances had German Orientalism also been treated in relation to the structures that have historically engendered it.

In many ways Lee M. Roberts's volume picks up where Kontje leaves off. It develops Kontje's notion of spatial imagination in national literatures. Like Kontje, Roberts draws on Said and post-colonial studies to problematize Germany's 'imagined East' and 'highlight how easily artistic and everyday expression can impose a hierarchy on the world that otherwise might not exist' (p. xiv). Drawing on a wide range of cultural productions from film and literature to philosophy, history, music, and architecture, contributors to the volume focus on Germany's 'middle' position by analysing how the conceptualizing of East and West defined and sharpened this position. Unlike Kontje's monograph, however, this volume does not purport to adhere to a chronological framework (in fact, the essays in the volume are arranged with no regard to chronology whatsoever), or to understand the historical-national contexts of cultural production. Instead, it seeks to locate certain themes in German culture that their producers associate with particular regions of the world east of Germany. What follows is a conceptual framework in which these regions are arranged into a system of relationships with Germany's national identity that is defined by what the contributors to this volume tend to see as varying degrees, akin to a typology of 'Easthood' in Germany's literary and cultural canon.

The choice of such a conceptual framework lies at the basis of the structure of the book, which is divided into four parts, each dedicated to a precise geographical 'East', loaded with a specific cultural meaning that sets it apart from the remaining sections. Thus the first section, 'Eastern "Germanies"', consisting of four essays ranging from an analysis of the disappearance and re-appearance of the GDR in the film *Goodbye Lenin!* (by Wendy Graham Westphal) to the Utopian construction of Bohemia in Ingeborg Bachmann's poem 'Böhmen liegt am Meer' (Sarah Painitz), sets out to explore the East with-

Review Article

in the German-speaking lands. The second section moves on to eastern Europe and examines how both eastern European nations such as Yugoslavia and Russia, but also eastern Europeans writing in German (as in the essay by Maria S. Grewe) can be conceptualized as the Other within the Self in cultural production in Germany. The third and final sections deal with the more conventional and historically constructed Orient, namely, the Middle East (Turkey and Persia), India, and the Far East.

As in Kontje's analysis, the use of imaginative geography and de-homogenization of the East in German literature in the volume enable a more nuanced conceptualization of the East in German culture and thus add a very useful dimension to our understanding of what was specific about German Orientalism. Studies of British or French Orientalism have tended to use a monolithic notion of the Orient without distinguishing between the cultural attributes of geographical locations in the spatial imagination. Following from Said's analysis, this tendency has resulted in understanding Orientalism purely in terms of binaries such as the Self and the Other or the hegemonic Western knowledge and colonized non-European cultures. In these studies, there is only a single West, just as there is a single East. The conceptualization of Germany's geographical and cultural position as that of a 'middle land' allows the watering-down of these binary relationships: seen from the middle, there is both East and West. This position results, as Kontje says, in the oscillation of German Orientalism between 'a compensatory Euro-centrism' (p. 8), which 'compensated for (Germany's) inability to be a real player on the international scene' (p. 6) and an Indo-Germanicism, which by virtue of its claims to Eastern, Aryan origins, was essentially anti-Western and anti-Semitic. Equally, the conceptualization of the East in the German spatial imagination in terms of varying degrees of cultural familiarity and alienation breaks the notion of a homogenous discourse on the East that so strongly dominates the engagement with Said's thesis in the context of France and Britain. Further, consciously moving away from the established literary traditions of German studies, both volumes reveal an awareness of the need for literary studies to respond to the challenge posed to their discipline in recent times by cultural studies and post-colonial theory. Both are representative of the response of German literary studies to some of the central questions about culture and identity in Europe and Asia that

Orientalism and the German Predicament

have been raised by these comparatively new fields of study. It is hardly surprising—and, indeed, very refreshing—that the volumes use and engage with the analytical categories commonly associated with the latter disciplines (for example, cultural displacement and multiple identities).

The Discipline of Research: Oriental Studies at the University

Sabine Mangold's monograph, originally her Ph.D. thesis, examines German Oriental studies from an entirely different perspective. The only really historical work of the three books being reviewed, her study addresses the close relationship between the academic disciplines that went by the name of Oriental studies at German universities and questions of culture. She thereby effectively links the history of science or disciplines (*Wissenschaftsgeschichte*) with some of the central questions posed in recent years by cultural studies. Recognizing that the rebuttal of Edward Said's thesis of the complicity of Orientalist scholarship with power structures had taken place at a discursive level, Mangold emphasizes the need to engage with it at the level of institutions and organizational structures in order to map out the precise way in which power could operate in the production of Oriental scholarship. By thus taking issue with Said by examining the structures and institutions that were instrumental to the development of Oriental studies in Germany, Mangold's book is an invaluable contribution to an overwhelmingly discourse-ridden field, which has traditionally been dominated by internal debates amongst Orientalists or by literary scholars, but rarely by historians.

The book engages with the basic premise of Said's thesis of the close involvement of Oriental scholarship in imperial power structures by starting with the obvious argument of Germany's late entry to colonialism and relatively insignificant overseas territorial possessions when compared with Britain and France. However, Mangold's study goes a step further by asking a question that addresses Germany's specific national context. Why and how was it that a discipline such as Oriental studies, which had no practical value whatsoever, a *Luxusfach* in fact, managed to establish itself and remain part of the academic canon in nineteenth-century German universities? It was not a requirement for school-teaching, which in turn pro-

Review Article

vided a major incentive for the choice of subjects read by students at university and determined the popularity of particular disciplines. Mangold attempts to answer this question by focusing on the internal, German academic context of Oriental studies from the beginning of the nineteenth century through the post-unification phase to the beginning of the First World War. She identifies three central lines of inquiry: first, the academic, cultural, and political-structural context that shaped the development of Oriental studies from 1800 to 1914; second, the position of Orientalists and Oriental scholarship within the constellation of disciplines at the university; and, third, the function and significance of the international context of Oriental studies for the discipline in Germany. These three questions define the underlying structure of her book.

Of the six main sections (excluding the introduction and conclusion), the first three are dedicated to the disciplinary history of Oriental studies in the context of the university in pre- and post-unification Germany. Mangold traces the turning point in Oriental studies to the emancipation of the discipline from its traditional status as a subsidiary discipline (*Hilfswissenschaft*) to theology and its gradual reorientation as a linguistic science, a development that she quite rightly locates in the early years of the nineteenth century. The second phase of the discipline's evolution, between 1835 and 1880, was marked by the increasing tendency to model Oriental studies along the lines of classical studies, which centred on the employment of stringent methods of text emendation. As is well known to scholars of the history of disciplines, the struggle to establish clear disciplinary identities is rarely free of conflict and Mangold provides some insightful examples of disputes on methodological rigour that became of utmost importance to Orientalists in establishing the legitimacy of their discipline. This phase also saw the increasing specialization of the discipline into its many branches and Mangold deals with this in great detail. Equally detailed is her treatment of the process of the institutionalization of Oriental studies into university chairs.

The following two sections of the book take the narrative to 1914, focusing on the Kaiserreich period and dwelling at great length on two of the most significant institutions of Oriental studies in Germany, ones that have hardly been dealt with in critical historical scholarship. These were the German Oriental Society (*Deutsche Mor-*

genländische Gesellschaft), which developed outside the university, and the Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen of the University of Berlin. In very different ways, these chapters provide useful insights into the working of Oriental studies in nineteenth-century Germany. The Society's main aim was to be, and appear to be, the united face of Oriental studies in Germany at a time when the discipline was actually becoming highly diversified. Throughout its history, Mangold takes pains to show, the Society remained a politically neutral body, by and large unsympathetic to Wilhelmine Germany's territorial ambitions. The Seminar, on the other hand, was drawn willy-nilly into the German colonial enterprise by serving as the training-ground of many a colonial officer.

The final section before the conclusion, which in the opinion of this reviewer constitutes the strongest part of the study, focuses on the turn away from linguistic studies in the Wilhelmine period to the study of cultures, especially the study of Islam, and to practice-oriented research. The section focusing on the beginning of historical and cultural studies of Islamic societies is obviously the author's *métier* as a scholar of Islam. The new trend, still fairly limited in scope, marked in Mangold's view a small but significant break with the text-oriented, antiquarian tradition of Oriental studies and a turn towards the 'modern' Orient. The traditional disdain for politics as something that would dilute scientific objectivity gave way to an increased interest in academics for a practical purpose, for a goal. This was a trend which, argues Mangold, must be understood in the context of the growing imperial interests of Wilhelmine Germany.

Sabine Mangold's study is a fine combination of solid empirical research on the structural history of Oriental studies and a readiness to engage with recent debates in cultural theory on the subject. Her response to Edward Said is nuanced. In general, Oriental studies in Germany was far too deeply wedded to the notion of objectivity and value-neutral, antiquarian scholarship, and Germany itself far too late and insignificant in its quest for colonies, for the discipline to be implicated in political agendas. Yet German Oriental scholarship was not free of the attitude of cultural superiority towards non-European peoples that was expressed in the civilizing mission of Europe's colonial powers, Britain, France, and the Netherlands. The desire to reform and revitalize the Orient by means of a Christian Occident underlay many of the assumptions of German Orientalist scholars.

Review Article

The colonial ambitions of the Wilhelmine Reich provided the foil for at least some of these aspirations. Nevertheless, in Mangold's view, the relationship between Oriental studies in Germany and cultural colonialism remained vague and not lacking in ambivalence. She demonstrates this with the brilliant example of the commemorative coin struck by the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft to celebrate its silver jubilee in 1870 which, in a reversal of the gendering of the Orient in colonial discourses, depicted the Orient as a man and the West as a woman (pp. 114–15). (Developing this point a little further than she has done would certainly have added an exciting dimension to the study.) Further, even in the Wilhelmine period, instances of the direct involvement of Orientalist scholars in Germany's programme of imperial expansion were few and far between, unlike in the case of the Dutch in Indonesia or the British. In both of these empires, Mangold argues, the complicity of Orientalists with the colonial enterprise was much more immediate, as many of them were, in fact, colonial functionaries. This is certainly a point worth stressing. At the same time, it is also worth noting at least in the case of the British Empire that, while training in local languages and cultures was a prerequisite for recruitment into the colonial civil services, British colonial officers were frequently inclined to learn local languages and customs while in service. The case of William Jones, renowned comparative philologist and founder of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, who was sent to India as judge and became a prominent Orientalist while there is one, but certainly not the only, example.

The strength of Sabine Mangold's study lies in the fact that it is the work of a historian who is also a scholar of Islam. While her canvas is large enough to include all the various branches of study that made up Oriental studies, her most convincing examples are, quite logically, drawn from Islamic studies. Indeed, this is her *métier*, but it is also a limitation. While her argument about the politics of German Oriental studies is extremely convincing and backed up with solid empirical research, it also focuses heavily on Islamic studies. Other research areas within Oriental studies tend to become less relevant, especially in the last few sections of the book. It is true that the Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen and the increased interest in the Ottoman Empire as possible areas of German imperial expansion dominate her story and, in view of the importance of the Middle East and the Balkans for German foreign policy in the late nineteenth and

early twentieth centuries, this preference is entirely justifiable. But what happened to related disciplines at this time? In less tangible ways they, too, were drawn into the politics of imperial Germany. At least one branch of Indology or Sanskrit studies, for example, was appropriated by comparative Indo-Germanic studies in the post-unification period, which in turn had much to do with the self-consciousness of the 'Reich-nation'. Mangold convincingly argues that it was the harmony and homogeneity amongst the various constituent sub-disciplines of Oriental studies that ensured the continued survival of the discipline. Nevertheless, such a view tends to gloss over the conflicts amongst, and uneven development of, the various branches of Oriental studies. It ignores, for example, the significance of the bitter debate over the supremacy of Arabic versus Sanskrit at the university of Bonn in the 1840s. It also assumes a certain homogeneity of methodological orientation amongst all the sub-disciplines in all the German states at the same time. While the shift from theology to philology was a dominant feature of nineteenth-century Oriental studies in Germany, smaller non-Prussian universities such as Tübingen, for example, continued to pursue a religious, cultural, and historical line of Orientalist research throughout this period.

Notwithstanding these issues, Sabine Mangold's study is groundbreaking in many respects. While this is by no means the first study of German Oriental scholarship, it is certainly one of the most comprehensive, covering all the individual research fields (from Arabic and later Islamic studies to Sinology, Assyriology, and Indology, to name but a few) that together constituted Oriental studies. More importantly, hers is probably the first historical study from a German academic context that engages with what has traditionally been an Anglo-American debate. Her extensive use of the archival sources of German universities, learned societies, and government and private papers lends her study much substance and depth and enables us to look beyond literary discourses into the operation of German Orientalist scholarship in its own institutional context. As a result, her conclusion that German Oriental scholarship, while reflecting much of the cultural arrogance of British, French, or Dutch Oriental studies and even supporting Germany's imperial ambitions, was a product of much more than power relations is convincing. That the German pursuit of such an exotic discipline was part of the idea of *Bildung*, of all-compassing general knowledge that did not necessari-

Review Article

ly have any pragmatic use, but was part of an educated person's repertoire, corroborates the findings of related studies in the area.¹⁷ What remains slightly underemphasized in the process is the main frame of reference, that is, the cultural colonialism of the established empires. French and (especially) British Oriental scholarship receive short shrift. Obviously, these are not the subject of Mangold's study, but they do provide its frame of reference and they certainly formed the basis of Said's theoretical formulations. But, in view of the overall scope and range of her study, this lack may be excused. By providing such insight into the precise historical context of its evolution as a discipline in the nineteenth century, the study fills a major gap in studies of Oriental scholarship and its relationship with Western cultural hegemony in the non-Western world.

Taken together, the three books discussed here are rich additions to our understanding of German Orientalism, as they shed much light on an extremely under-researched aspect of the topic. The importance of their contribution can really be appreciated in the context of the sheer volume of German Orientalist scholarship in the nineteenth century, the prestige it enjoyed internationally, and the consistent presence of German Orientalists in academic contexts beyond Germany's boundaries. At the same time, the volumes also shed light on added dimensions of Orientalism and its more nuanced ways of operating than has resulted from the scholarship on British and French Orientalism. In Sabine Mangold's case, this has taken the form of looking beyond Said to other, less well-examined, cultural components of Orientalist scholarship in Germany and examining Orientalism's historical context. In the case of Kontje and Roberts, it has succeeded in paring down Orientalism to a differentiation of the spatial imagination rather than a monolithic discourse in the West on the East.

¹⁷ I have come to similar conclusions in my own work. See Indra Sengupta, *From Salon to Discipline: State, University and Indology in Germany, 1821–1914* (Würzburg, 2005).

Orientalism and the German Predicament

INDRA SENGUPTA has been a Research Fellow at the GHIL since 2004. Her research interests include the history of encounters between European and non-European cultures, German Orientalism, and British colonialism in India. Among her publications is *From Salon to Discipline: State, University and Indology in Germany, 1821–1914* (2005).

BOOK REVIEWS

HANS-HENNING KORTÜM (ed.) *Transcultural Wars from the Middle Ages to the Twenty-First Century* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006), 274 pp. ISBN-10: 3 05 004131 5. ISBN-13: 978 3 05 004131 5. EUR 54.80

Defining 'war' poses a challenge. War, of course, involves violence. But what other necessary ingredients turn mere use of force into war? Modern dictionary definitions emphasize the participation of major socio-political groupings and, especially, (nation-)states. Wahrig's *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (1968), for example, has the pithy definition 'bewaffnete Auseinandersetzung zwischen Staaten, Stämmen oder Völkern' (armed conflict between states, tribes, or peoples). Such a typical definition implies that war is a political phenomenon and it reflects the traditional notion that war is a rational instrument purposefully employed by political actors. But do these preconditions apply to all social phenomena which we label war? Is 'the political' a necessary characteristic? Seeing war as essentially political in nature has become a hotly contested issue since the end of the Cold War. Many conflicts which we could not but term 'wars' have appeared to possess non-political causes, and few seemed to involve states or other actors whom we would recognize as political.

Since the early 1990s the search has been on for an adjective that more accurately captures the essence of what many see as 'new wars'. Under the impact of the war that tore apart Yugoslavia, the first adjective to achieve prominence was 'ethnic'. This label chimed with the rhetoric employed by the major protagonists themselves. Serbs, Croats, and Kosovars depicted their struggle as a war for national survival. But however much the competing ethnic groups deemed this to be a positive sentiment, the Western-dominated international community disagreed. It saw 'hyper' nationalism as an exceedingly negative, politically senseless motive which explained the apparent anarchy and barbarism of the conflict. Yet, over time, what should have been clear all along became increasingly obvious: the war (or wars) had been a series of competing state-building projects tightly orchestrated by extremist leaders and pursued with great, yet instrumental brutality. So, after all, the conflict did fit within a traditional political understanding of war.

Yet the ongoing wars in Africa in the 1990s kept alive a sense that the nature of conflict was changing. But it was 9/11 that re-ignited fears that war had undergone a fundamental and global transformation. The 'war on terror', which influential people regarded as the conflict likely to dominate the twenty-first century, seemed non-political in nature. The range of adjectives that were applied reflected unease with traditional understandings of war. To name just a few, 'asymmetric', 'irregular', and 'unconventional' war, as well as the new term 'the war on terror', or indeed the word 'terrorism', all suggested that this war was 'against the norm' and would therefore be marked by extreme and senseless behaviour. Interestingly, adjectives which might have suggested a more political nature, especially concerning Iraq, such as 'guerrilla' or 'civil' war, struggled to catch on.

If 'nation' and 'state' were no longer the guiding principles giving meaning to war, what was? One word waiting in the wings ready to fill the void was 'culture'. When the best-selling British military historian John Keegan published *A History of Warfare* in 1993, he had reminded a wide audience that 'culture is . . . a prime determinant of the nature of warfare' (p. 387). Keegan, however, tried to pull off something that went against the grain. The orthodoxy assumes that the political restrains, or at least controls, war. The state as the embodiment of the political has long been understood to possess, as its distinguishing characteristic, a monopoly of violence. If politics is replaced by something else, such as a basic cultural expression like religion, wars will get out of control. Keegan argued instead that, as the world wars illustrated, it was politics that led to horrific irrational conflict. Culture, on the other hand, and especially professional military culture, he claimed, was a hedge against total, all-consuming war. This claim, arguably, betrayed a strong attachment to an idealized vision of the British military and mistook its strain of military professionalism for a general type—students of the pre-1945 German military, for example, might easily be tempted to disagree. In addition, Keegan's concept of culture was, to put it gently, underdeveloped.

The book under review, which grew out of a conference held in 2004 at the University of Regensburg under the auspices of that university's *Krieg im Mittelalter* research group and the *Institut für Sozialforschung* in Hamburg, is an attempt to fill the void Keegan created. Its central aim is to supply a historically grounded cultural typology of war. At first sight the book, which includes contributions

Book Reviews

from a prominent group of medieval military historians, appears well placed to provide a fundamental contribution to the debates on the definition and understanding of war. After all, nation and state did not begin to emerge until late in the Middle Ages and medievalists should naturally be favourably predisposed towards other explanatory variables, such as culture. And considering that religion is invariably seen as a basic expression of culture which has come to the fore again in the 'war on terror', the medieval clash between Christianity and Islam could provide useful historical insights. Another attraction of the volume, deserving of strong praise, is that it brings together medieval with early modern and modern historians. As the book notes, historians of different periods do not tackle complicated yet important 'transhistorical' concepts together as often as they should. One might also add that the voice of trained medieval historians has been remarkably muted in the 'neo-medievalism' and war debate that has tempted a sizeable number of political scientists down some strange analytical pathways in the past decade.

The high hopes with which one starts reading the volume are not in every respect fulfilled. Intriguingly, the contributors display significant differences in how they approach the issue, which could be seen as culturally determined. The British historians—Michael Prestwich, Hew Strachan, Matthew Strickland, Corinne Saunders, and Andrew Ayton—focus primarily on the ways in which war has been fought through the narration of a series of historical anecdotes. Their contributions on the whole do not explicitly or systematically engage with assumptions, methodology, or with definitions. As a result, the validity of interpretations and conclusions often relies more on author and reader happening to share, a priori, each other's opinions and beliefs than on the author's deeper, reasoned understanding and explanation of how culture interacts with war. The German contributors—Hans-Henning Kortüm, Bernhard R. Kroener, Birgit Beck-Hepner, Hannes Möhring, Michael Hochgeschwender, and Daniel Hohrath (hesitantly joined by Stephen Morillo, the lone American medieval historian)—follow a very different pattern. They explicitly ground themselves in what they see as the relevant literature (providing readers not familiar with the recent, rich German literature on war with many useful references) and they overwhelmingly try to develop a central thesis of some general applicability while trying to be mindful of definitions, method, and assumptions.

Yet even their contributions often disappoint. Exceptions are Birgit Beck-Heppner, who provides an excellent overview of literature and issues regarding 'gender specific crimes' in modern warfare, and Michael Hochgeschwender's introduction on enemy images (*Feindbilder*), though the substance of his contribution on American Civil War enemy images suffers from such a profusion of fine distinctions that the exposition of the main point is confusing. In the end, the concept of 'culture' remains rather too broad and hence an understanding of how it influences war elusive. In a sense, the contributors are not interested in how culture – however defined – influences war. Rather, their primary concern is to understand why wars can degenerate into extreme displays of senseless violence (Hew Strachan senses this in his gently sceptical contribution). Applying a 'typology' of cultures, especially if one stays close to conventional understandings of which major cultures inhabited the world, leads to a fundamental problem. Wars both between 'Big Cultures' (as Stephen Morillo terms them) and within cultures have exhibited extreme violence. The editor is therefore forced to lump them together into the category of 'transcultural wars'. The other type, which used to be better known as 'limited war', is accorded its own category of 'intra-cultural war'. Such a typology is of very little explanatory value.

Still, the presentation of a wide range of examples of belligerent conduct illustrates two useful findings. Repeatedly, the book shows that intercultural wars, like the Crusades, were not as violent as many people believe. Cultural difference may, or may not, therefore, fuel enmity. They also bring out, less surprisingly, that cultures are not immune to spawning wars of great cruelty within their borders. Familiarity thus may, or may not, breed contempt. These conclusions may give some cause for comfort to those who fear an all-consuming conflagration between the West and Islam, while also providing a warning to those who believe that the West need no longer fear war within its borders. To understand why this may be the case, however, requires a different study.

JAN WILLEM HONIG is Professor of Military Strategy at the Swedish National Defence College, Stockholm, and Senior Lecturer

Book Reviews

in War Studies, King's College London. A medieval historian by training, he has published on Clausewitz, contemporary strategy, and medieval warfare. He is currently working on a book analysing the development of Western ideas on how wars are won.

SAMUEL K. COHN, JR., *Lust for Liberty. The Politics of Social Revolt in Medieval Europe, 1200–1425: Italy, France and Flanders* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006), xii + 376 pp. ISBN 978 0 674 02162 4. £32.95. \$49.95

Samuel Cohn has already published a number of works on unrest and uprisings in Italy (Florence), the 1381 peasants' revolt in England, and the consequences of the Black Death and subsequent bouts of plague. In the book under review here, he extends the focus temporally to cover a period of more than 200 years, and geographically to take in large parts of western Europe (Italy, France, Flanders, and England). The Iberian peninsula is largely ignored in this volume, and Germany does not exist at all, not even as a concept – all we have is 'German-speaking areas'. The title *Lust for Liberty* confers a particular thematic and substantive emphasis on the whole work. The sources on which this volume is based are contemporary chronicles (specifically, the *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, *Rerum Gallicarum et Francicarum Scriptores*, *Scriptores* of the MGH, *Chroniques Liégeoises*, and *Fonti per la storia d'Italia*), supplemented by a number of deeds and judicial documents. The author analyses this extensive material, asking, in particular, what if anything changed in the nature and aims of popular revolts after the Black Death (1348–50). The only comparative study on this subject so far, *Ongles bleus, Jacques et Ciompi: Les révolutions populaires en Europe aux XIVe et XVe siècles* (1970) by Michel Mollat und Philippe Wolff provides a positive influence for Cohn's grand project, which aims to refute the argument first put by Henri Pirenne that the revolts of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries should be classified as revolutions of the crafts, and that after the plague (from 1350), they originated in the misery of the people. Cohn uses a much broader source base than his predecessors. He draws on 298 chronicles, with more than 1,600 descriptions of popular movements relating to 1,112 individual incidents. This makes it possible to gain insights and draw conclusions from a statistical comparison. What is striking is the sharp increase in the frequency of revolts after the Black Death. Between 1200 and 1348, Cohn identifies 470 revolts (according to Cohn this translates into 2.73 per year, which is incorrect); between 1350 and 1425, there were 621 (8.06 per year, again incorrect), 'nearly triple' (p. 228). This statistic, however, must be placed in the context of the greatly

Book Reviews

increased number of sources which survive, especially urban chronicles. It cannot, therefore, be used for comparative purposes and its value is relativized.

What were the consequences of the Black Death, and how did it change patterns of behaviour? First, it should be noted that subsequent bouts of plague did not have the devastating impact of the Black Death, nor did they evoke the same radical responses. Thus in 1382, for example, the doctor Raymond Chalmelli de Vinario optimistically assessed survival rates among the general population. He established that in 1348 two-thirds of the population had become sick, in 1361 one-half, in 1371 only 10 per cent, and in 1382 just 5 per cent. He pointed out that fewer and fewer people were dying of the plague, for which he credited advances in the art of medicine. According to Cohn, these and other comparable contemporary statements express a growing belief that circumstances could be changed and document an increased confidence in the power of human agency in the social arena. This change, he argues, is reflected in the trajectory and objectives of unrest from the middle of the century. Immediately after the Black Death there were hardly any revolts that could be described as political or social (with the possible exception of those in Flanders). The flagellants' and anti-Semitic movements, he argues, should be seen as the expression of a profound uncertainty and anxiety. They were followed, not immediately but seven to ten years later, by social and political rebellions. In Italy, such incidents were densely clustered. They took place in Gaeta, Viterbo, Pavia, Bologna, and Modena, then in 1355 from Naples to Venice, especially in the towns of Tuscany and in Piedmont, but also in Udine, Ancona, Fermo, and Rimini. For France, of course, Étienne Marcel and the Jacquerie of 1357-8 must be mentioned, but also the uprisings in the Languedoc. There the consequences of the Hundred Years War and tax increases imposed because of the many plague deaths were significant. Given the rapidly increasing demand for labour with wages soon rising and food prices staying stable or even falling (which did not exclude occasional revolts because of poverty), protest (apart from resistance to higher dues) was directed more towards social and political issues. These included party-building or conflicts about precedence or dependence among social groups and towns. Although there are no indications of relations let alone influence between these contemporaneous similar developments in post-

plague Europe, 'a hidden sense of unity' (p. 227) points to a 'common community', Cohn suggests, that was united by the idea of freedom and shaped events. The main incidents occurred from the 1370s to the beginning of the 1380s, and took place from Italy to England, but they did not simply stop with Charles VI of France's victory at Rozebeke in 1382. Uprisings continued until 1425.

The common, new element which Cohn identifies—and this brings us to the heart of his argument—namely, the call for freedom and social change, comes to the fore more and more strongly and clearly. According to the chronicler of St-Denis, Michele Pintoin, *Libertas* was associated with desire, lust, and greed. Before the plague, a total of only sixteen rebellions of this sort could be identified; during the shorter period after it, however, there were forty-eight. Examples include Pavia from 1354 to 1360; the many revolts against the tyranny of papal rule between 1375 and 1378 in more than sixty towns and 1,577 villages; the revolts known as Harelle in Rouen from 1382; and incidents in Paris, Flanders, and England in these years. In the words of Pintoin, 'the appetite for liberty was burning . . . the lust for new things incessant' (p. 242). According to Cohn, a new self-confidence and class-consciousness developed and was expressed among the artisans in particular. After the Black Death, they organized protests and uprisings 'collectively, and with increased frequency', in order 'to gain liberty, to preserve their dignity, and to expand their rights and those of their communities, thus shaping their future welfare' (p. 242). Cohn tells us little about how this process came about, or what course it took in each case. Nonetheless, his wide-ranging comparison has the great advantage of cutting sight-lines through a dense forest and establishing clearly defined periods. As a result, western Europe appears as a standard of comparison on this question. Added to this are many important observations on certain areas and individual themes that can only be mentioned in passing: peasants' revolts, economic revolts, the differences between revolts, leaders, women, ideology and suppression, communication and alliances, and flags and slogans.

But the doubts that arise while reading this book cannot simply be put aside. They start with the figures and statistics. According to Cohn, the 'lust for liberty' shot up soon after 1348, from sixteen revolts of this type before the Black Death to forty-eight after it, which he presents as a fourfold increase. Apart from the fact that this

Book Reviews

is actually a threefold increase, this comparison is neither illuminating nor convincing, for the figures which Cohn himself gives earlier suggest that there was a general increase in uprisings for the second phase as a whole, even if it was not so great. This must, therefore, have an impact on the incidence of 'liberty revolts'. And the concept of 'liberty' is not enough. What expressions have to appear in the sources for them to be included in his statistics? What sort of freedom is meant in each case, or more generally, can there be any popular uprisings without some sort of impetus towards liberty at all? A study that focuses so clearly on such a specific thesis should have dealt more seriously with this and other substantive issues on ideas of freedom. But its aims and objectives are different. This work, the first to undertake a comparative classification and evaluation of this sort and on this scale, does not get lost in theoretical analyses and individual case studies. Rather, on the broad basis of contemporary chronicles, it offers vivid insights into a long and diverse process of development, and provides statistical statements about it. The density of information and thematic classifications is impressive, but cannot distract from some daring interpretations.

KNUT SCHULZ is Emeritus Professor at the Free University of Berlin. He has published extensively on medieval constitutional and urban history and the history of knights and artisans. Among his books are *'Denn sie liebten die Freiheit so sehr': Kommunale Erhebungen und die Entstehung des Bürgertums im Europa des 11. bis 13. Jahrhunderts* (1992) and, with Christian Schuchard, *Handwerker deutscher Herkunft und ihre Bruderschaften im Rom der Renaissance* (2005).

HEINZ SCHILLING, *Konfessionalisierung und Staatsinteressen: Internationale Beziehungen 1559–1660*, Handbuch der Geschichte der Internationalen Beziehungen, 2 (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2007), xxvi + 673 pp. ISBN 978 3 506 73722 9. EUR 128.00

Each of the volumes in Schöningh's nine-volume series on European international relations has its own specific title, generally pairing two concepts clearly intended by its author as defining characteristics of the epoch assigned him by the editors, Heinz Duchhardt and Franz Knipping. Heinz Schilling has chosen 'confessionalization and interests of state' as overarching themes for the early modern volume. He opens by identifying the century after the Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis as one of transition towards the modern international system. Europe was more clearly defined geographically at this point than either before or since because Russia, the Ottoman empire, and the rest of the world were not yet integrated as equal partners in a common international order.

Schilling's structure is predetermined by the series format, dividing the book into three equal parts that analyse structural conditions, identify actors, and discuss the main events. The third part is generally chronological and offers a detailed yet succinct overview of the major conflicts. The second divides Europe into four regions, including the Ottoman-dominated south east. This allows for discussion of internal problems, notably civil wars, that had international consequences, as well as conveying a good sense of the political fragmentation of the Continent. The first part is dominated, appropriately given the period, by the twin problems of state formation and religious schism. Schilling eschews an overly materialist discussion of political developments, rightly emphasizing how conventionally weak states, such as the papacy or Calvinist Geneva, exerted influence disproportionate to their size, wealth, or military potential. He also notes that the incomplete character of most European states allowed other 'actors' on the international stage, such as armed mercantile companies, religious orders, and representative institutions.

Religion is discussed through the 'confessionalization' thesis to which the author has already contributed substantially in earlier publications. The emphasis here centres on the consequences for international relations of the formation of distinct confessions within Christian Europe, rather than how that process came about. The cen-

Book Reviews

tral argument is that confessionalization occurred during the transition of the European states system following the failure of the Habsburgs' attempt to prolong late-medieval universalism through their dynastic empire. Confessionalization filled a void until a new system of relations emerged based on secular concepts of international law. It enabled states and non-state actors to forge links across considerable distances based on common faith. Confessional networks were generally wider than inter-state alliances and were greatly assisted by the media and communications revolution that has received attention recently, especially by Wolfgang Behringer. This and other work on what has been dubbed the 'cultural history of international relations' is deftly woven into a lucid discussion of the forms of inter-state communication and diplomacy. Considerable importance is attached to the concept of a generational shift around 1580 as people who had only known religious schism reached maturity and positions of influence. They displaced those who still believed compromise might restore the lost harmony. Schilling argues this process accelerated around 1600, coinciding with the intensification of state-building as rulers sought to impose their exclusive authority over intermediary bodies, recalcitrant nobles, and fractious provinces. This argument suggests structural causes for the widespread warfare, especially the Thirty Years War. The latter's epicentre is identified as the Holy Roman Empire that is described as only 'partially modernized' (pp. 352-3). Schilling sees the Empire's constitutional problems as an implosion that triggered a general European war, an 'inferno' (pp. 415, 417) that forged the modern states system. By coupling the political and religious crises, the author hopes to resolve the current controversy, exemplified by the debate between Johannes Burkhardt and Axel Gotthard, over the true character of early modern conflict. The coincidence of confessional tension with state interests pursued with unparalleled vigour, means that war was simultaneously about religion and state-building.

Overall, this is an impressive synthesis. The author is genuinely international in his choice of secondary authorities and inclusive in his approach. The text is admirably clear, though something has gone awry in the production, especially in part B of chapter six where the discussion breaks off abruptly on p. 419. The author covers a vast terrain, geographically, chronologically, and historiographically. Even in a work of this size, this has led to some compression, though none

that detracts substantially from its clarity or utility. Overall, however, the book's reception will depend on how far the reader is prepared to accept the confessionalization thesis. The volume has provided Schilling with the opportunity to present the definitive statement of this interpretation. Some might question whether the underlying concept is sufficiently robust to explain the transition Schilling describes so effectively. There are times where he is forced to acknowledge qualifications to his argument. Those urging peace, like Lerma or Oldenbarnevelt, are grouped as the older generation that lost influence to the younger, confessionalized militants around 1600. These moderates are presented as swimming against the tide, with the result that events such as the outbreak of war in central Europe in 1618 appear almost inevitable. There is little scope here for contingency. He also notes the presence of cross-confessional alliances, such as the attempt by the Palatine and Bohemian leadership to ally with the Ottomans in 1620. Such attempts are reduced to aberrations in a general trend towards confessionalized relations. The problems encountered by Savoy and Stuart England in maintaining stable external relations are blamed on their failure to adhere to this trend. However, the most successful power to emerge by 1660 was France that regularly allied with Protestants. How many exceptions can we have if the rule is still to be proved? Above all, the book's concluding section betrays the limits to the confessional argument. Schilling endorses the standard interpretation of the Westphalian settlement (seen here in its widest sense as the treaties between 1648 and 1660) as secularizing international relations by taking religion out of politics. This was possible, he claims, because politicians could still distinguish between the two, despite their supposed fusion around 1600. It is a measure of the volume's success that it provokes such reflections and it is to be welcomed both as an accessible 'handbook' and an important piece of scholarship that advances the debate on early modern international relations.

PETER H. WILSON is GF Grant Professor of History at the University of Hull. He is currently on AHRC-funded leave completing a general study of the Thirty Years War. An article reviewing the debate on the war's causes will appear in the *English Historical Review* later in 2008.

ANDREW THOMPSON, *Britain, Hanover and the Protestant Interest, 1688–1756*, Studies in Early Modern Cultural, Political and Social History, 3 (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2006), xv + 267 pp. ISBN 1 84383 241 0. £50.00. \$85.00 (hardback)

A number of recent studies of connections between England, Scotland, and Ireland in the eighteenth century have cast new light on what actually constituted 'Great Britain' politically, socially, and culturally. In some cases the perspective has been expanded to include the Atlantic world. For far too long, however, too little notice has been taken of the fact that for almost the entire 'long' eighteenth century, with only one short interruption, the British monarch was also the ruler of a territory on the Continent of Europe. Asking to what extent Continental connections at this time helped to constitute Britain as a body politic is more than a question about anti-Catholic or anti-French enemy images. Tony Claydon has most recently shown how strongly the Continent influenced the shape of British culture.¹ The fact that Continental politics and, in particular, the interests and problems of Hanover were also closely related to supposedly genuine British politics is demonstrated by Andrew Thompson's study. This places it in the context of recent works which have revived historical interest in the period and the specific features of the personal union between Electoral Hanover and Britain.²

Andrew Thompson's book grew out of a Ph.D. dissertation accepted by Cambridge University in 2003. Drawing on an impressive number of archival and published sources, the author demonstrates how British politics were entangled in Continental concerns, and investigates political discourses and mutual perceptions in the field of diplomacy. For Thompson, the unifying thread is the Protestant interest, which served as an argument and justification for Continental politics. This could, but did not necessarily have to, overlap with the contemporary idea of a balance of power. The generally

¹ Tony Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England, 1660–1760* (Cambridge, 2007).

² See, most recently, Rex Rexheuser (ed.), *Die Personalunion von Sachsen-Polen 1697–1763 und Hannover-England, 1714–1837: Ein Vergleich* (Wiesbaden, 2005); Brendan Simms, Brendan and Torsten Rott (eds.), *The Hanoverian Dimension in British History, 1714–1837* (Cambridge, 2007).

accepted statement that British policy was concerned with the balance of power is, therefore, not enough. Rather, we have to ask how such a policy was implemented, and how it defined itself against other policies.

The study looks at the politics of a period which, even in German historiography, is not among the best researched. At its heart are the connections between Britain and the Electorate of Hanover in their imperial and European entanglements during the first half of the eighteenth century. Building on a solid basis, Thompson provides evidence for what has variously been addressed in the research so far but has not been thoroughly demonstrated for international politics. He shows that in the supposedly tolerant period of the Enlightenment and until well into the eighteenth century, conflicts of faith and confessional disputes determined everyday politics far more than, according to the conventional wisdom, should have been possible after the Peace of Westphalia. Thus on the German side this study fits into recent trends in research on the Empire and confessionalization.³ From the English point of view, it contributes to re-establishing religion as a political factor in the 'enlightened' eighteenth century.⁴

The aim of the study is to re-assess three interconnected aspects: the foreign policy of George I and George II; the role of foreign policy in the public debate, especially in Britain; and the issue of confession between Britain and Hanover. What holds them all together is the Protestant interest. According to the author, this was not an example of backwards-looking confessional politics, but an idea central to eighteenth-century power relations that was expressed in political perceptions as much as in concrete diplomatic (although hardly in military) acts. Building on the work of the American historian Stephen Pincus, Thompson claims that what was crucial was not

³ Gabriele Haug-Moritz, 'Kaisertum und Parität: Reichspolitik und Konfession nach dem Westfälischen Frieden', *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung*, 19 (1992), 445–82; ead., 'Corpus Evangelicorum und deutscher Dualismus', in Volker Press and Dieter Stievermann (eds.), *Alternativen zur Reichsverfassung in der Frühen Neuzeit?* (Munich, 1995), 189–207; Jürgen Luh, *Unheiliges Römisches Reich: Der konfessionelle Gegensatz 1648–1806* (Potsdam, 1995).

⁴ See, among others, J. C. D. Clark, *English Society, 1688–1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice during the Ancien Régime* (Cambridge, 1985; 2nd edn., 2000); William Gibson and Robert G. Ingram (eds.), *Religious Identities in Britain, 1660–1832* (Aldershot, 2005).

Book Reviews

'how popish . . . a power like France "really" was. The British and Hanoverian perception that France was a threat to protestantism is telling. Rhetoric can reveal what people were prepared to believe' (p. 15).

The geographical scope of the study is the Holy Roman Empire and central Europe, where Britain-Hanover's impact is analysed on the basis of diplomatic correspondence and journalistic comment. Among the huge quantities of manuscript sources which the author has worked through, the material held in the state archives in Hanover, the Niedersächsisches Hauptstaatsarchiv Hannover, takes pride of place. So far this material has been used far too little by historians for the period after 1714. In addition to the papers of the German chancery (Deutsche Kanzlei) in London, this archive also holds an almost complete run of Electoral Hanover's reports from the Imperial Diet in Regensburg.

The first chapter of Thompson's book investigates the relationship between concepts of the Protestant interest, a balance of power, and a universal monarchy, analysing contemporary journalism and historiographical positions. Although Britain was frequently allied with Catholic powers such as the Habsburg empire in the eighteenth century, Thompson sees the Protestant orientation as conferring a special quality on its European policy: 'Britain and Hanover played the role of balancer within the European state system partly to preserve their territorial security but also to ensure that protestantism survived' (p. 40). Building on this, the second chapter sums up the conditions for a policy of the Protestant interest before 1714. Thompson briefly addresses the political situation in Britain under William III, Hanover's position in the succession and attitude towards Protestantism in the Empire, the significance of the Huguenots as diplomatic mediators, and the war of the Spanish succession. The fact that Hanover largely owed its elevation in rank (and thus also its eligibility to fill the British throne) to its pro-Habsburg policy and that Vienna's intention was to develop it into an imperial ally remains rather in the background.

The third chapter begins in 1719 and deals with the confessional crisis in the Palatinate and its impact up to 1724. This episode, known as the German religious struggle (*Religionsstreit*), grew out of the Palatinate's confessional situation, which had been confused since the end of the seventeenth century. In 1719 the crisis became more

acute when the Catholic prince elector banned the Heidelberg catechism used by the Reformed church, something which alarmed Britain, Brandenburg-Prussia, the Protestant Imperial Estates, and numerous European theologians in equal measure. On the basis of the correspondences conducted by Wrisberg, the Hanoverian envoy to the Imperial Diet in Regensburg and Whitworth, his British colleague in Berlin, Thompson shows how strongly George I, with the assistance of his envoys, espoused the Protestant initiative in the Empire. He probably worked more actively to resolve the conflict than the Prussian king; English and Hanoverian politics seem almost inseparable here. In addition, it becomes clear that in George I's policies, the Protestant interest found its way into the public sphere through journalism in both Britain and the Empire, thus becoming a political factor that could no longer be ignored.

The same applies to the Thorn 'massacre' of 1724, which is discussed in chapter four. As a result of reporting, an essentially regional dispute between Lutherans and Catholics in the town of Thorn in Royal (Polish) Prussia further aggravated the confrontation between Catholics and Protestants in Europe. Britain's interests as a power guaranteeing the treaty of Oliva became mixed up with notions of Protestant unity, but also economic competition between British interests and the policy of the Habsburg Ostende Company. All this resulted in attempts at Protestant bloc-building which, in turn, impacted back on Britain and the Empire through the media.

As far as the protection of Protestant rights was concerned, politicians and writers in Britain-Hanover, as in other Protestant territories, liked to refer to the Peace of Westphalia. The attempt to work on a revision of the famous Clause Four in the Ryswick treaty must be understood against this background, as must the international cooperation from 1732 to supply Salzburg's Protestants, who practically precipitated a competition in the display of Protestant charity between Augsburg, Halle, London, and Ebenezer, Georgia. Repeatedly, on these occasions, Hanover made use of the personal union with Britain, and vice versa. All these themes, in addition to the role of Walpole and British politics in the war of the Polish succession, are discussed in chapters five and six, which cover the period after the accession of George II in 1727. From the 1730s, however, the empirical evidence suggests that the significance of the discourse about an international Protestant interest decreased more rapidly than the

Book Reviews

author sometimes acknowledges. When, in chapter seven, Thompson speaks of the decline of the Protestant interest and a parallel rise in the incidence of certain terms such as 'old system' or 'common cause', we may surmise that there was a greater mixing of these notions and mutual overlapping of Protestant and secular arguments in the preceding period as well.

There is no doubt that after the Peace of Westphalia, confessionally motivated conflicts and cooperation did not disappear, but occurred more frequently at an institutional level. Thompson's study impressively and often very clearly emphasizes the significance of confession for imperial politics and power relations in Europe. However, contrary to the author's view, there has for quite some time no longer been a 'general agreement . . . amongst German historians' (p. 26) that the confessional period came to a sudden end in 1648. Almost fifteen years ago Wolfgang Reinhard argued that the definition of the confessional age should be extended at least until the emigration of the Salzburg Protestants, and this idea has been taken up in numerous other, more recent, works.⁵

Thompson's study postulates the survival of a 'religious foreign policy' (p. 29) during the age of the Enlightenment. However, it mostly analyses not so much religious foreign policy as, very convincingly, the foreign policy significance of rhetoric and argument drawn from confessional politics until well into the eighteenth century. The actual role of religion, by contrast, remains rather pale. It could, perhaps, best be approached by looking not at diplomatic correspondence, but at the less official contacts beyond the great political actors. What appears to be common to Protestantism at diplomatic level sometimes covers over the big differences and points of conflict within contemporary Protestantism, which also had some political significance. In addition to his plea for a re-assessment of the

⁵ Wolfgang Reinhard, 'Was ist katholische Konfessionalisierung?', in id. and Heinz Schilling (eds.), *Die katholische Konfessionalisierung* (Gütersloh, 1995), 419–52; Thomas Kaufmann, *Dreißigjähriger Krieg und Westfälischer Friede: Kirchengeschichtliche Studien zur lutherischen Konfessionskultur* (Tübingen, 1998); Andreas Holzem, *Religion und Lebensformen: Katholische Konfessionalisierung im Sendgericht des Fürstbistums Münster, 1570–1800* (Paderborn, 2000); Heinz Duchhardt and Gerhard May (eds.), *Union – Konversion – Toleranz: Dimensionen der Annäherung zwischen den christlichen Konfessionen im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Mainz, 2000).

religious aspect in the history of diplomacy, Thompson also writes against the trend found in the older literature, which traditionally focused on Brandenburg-Prussia, explicitly emphasizing the significance of Hanover for imperial politics. However, the danger exists of sometimes pushing Brandenburg-Prussia's role too far into the background. After all, this state's role as one of the most important power factors in the Empire and in Europe did not start with Frederick the Great.

It is a great achievement of Andrew Thompson's to have made us more aware of the connections between British and Hanoverian politics and their significance for eighteenth-century Europe. However, whether it was really 'a sense of confessional unity' (p. 43) that brought—and kept—Britain and Hanover together could be investigated further in light of the contemporary discussions around the Lutheran confession of the Hanoverian kings. Occasionally, a clearer distinction could have been drawn between pro-Protestant, anti-Catholic, and anti-French politics, or between the sometimes quite different relationships maintained by Britain and Hanover with certain European powers, such as the Habsburg empire.

The author's decision to illuminate 'previously neglected issues' (p. 62) by means of synchronous cross-sections instead of an encyclopaedic and chronological narrative of British-Hanoverian politics over a long period is courageous and understandable. But it does make temporal leaps inevitable, and certain sections can seem somewhat episodic, giving the impression of being taken out of context. Conversely, however, this method offers insights into connections and numerous new aspects extracted from the sources. It also shows that the early eighteenth century still offers many opportunities for continuing research. On the whole, this book provides a dense, fact-filled, and solidly source-based account. It contributes crucially to linking Britain's Continental policy more strongly with the contemporary context of Hanover and the Holy Roman Empire, and will be essential reading on this subject. It also provides an important corrective to some of the other work published so far, and will surely stimulate further research.

ALEXANDER SCHUNKA teaches early modern history at the university of Stuttgart. His publications include *Soziales Wissen und dörf-*

Book Reviews

liche Welt: Herrschaft, Jagd und Naturwahrnehmung in Zeugenaussagen des Reichskammergerichts aus Nordschwaben (16.–17. Jahrhundert) (2000) and *Gäste, die bleiben: Zuwanderer in Kursachsen und der Oberlausitz im 17. und frühen 18. Jahrhundert* (2006). At present he is preparing a study on the relationship between British and Prussian theologians and churchmen in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

CARSTEN KRETSCHMANN, *Räume öffnen sich: Naturhistorische Museen im Deutschland des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel, 12 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006), 365 pp. ISBN 978 3 05 004202 2. EUR 59.80

Like so many cultural institutions that still attract large numbers of people today, natural history museums came into existence during the nineteenth century. With their numerous exhibits ranging from rocks to fossils to stuffed animals and, in some cases, to the material artifacts of what were formerly known as 'primitive societies', they served (and still do serve) as sites of knowledge production and dissemination. Their appeal to the public derives from an impulse to learn that is sometimes coupled with a desire to experience mild forms of revulsion. Carsten Kretschmann examines how, from the late eighteenth to the early twentieth century, German natural history museums popularized scientific knowledge in a society searching for new forms of orientation in a period of multiple dynamic and frequently unsettling transformations. In particular, he traces the genesis, growth, and management of collections; he also analyses particular display practices and charts changes in the social composition of visitors.

Kretschmann concentrates on four case studies that illustrate the diversity of Germany's museum landscape. In Karlsruhe, a small museum emerged from several courtly collections dating from the eighteenth century. The Museum für Naturkunde in Berlin, on the other hand, had its origins in an anthology of specimens that the new university used for teaching purposes. The Senckenberg Museum in Frankfurt highlights how civic initiatives furthered an institution devoted to natural history that owed its existence to a tightly knit network of local associations. Ethnographic objects, trade commodities from far-flung places, and specimens from the natural world, meanwhile, formed the foci of collections in Bremen, whose heterogeneous Museum für Natur- Völker- und Handelskunde grew out of the local natural history society. No matter whether these institutions owed their existence to civic or state initiatives, one theme runs prominently through their nineteenth-century histories: they chronically lacked money, a fact that manifested itself in the cramped, shabby conditions in which many objects were kept. Collections may have expanded vastly through trading contacts, exchanges, gifts, and pur-

Book Reviews

chases, but they moved to representative surroundings bespeaking pride of possession only towards the century's end, when museums came to be housed in ostentatious edifices.

The collections of objects from far and near had several purposes. In addition to trumpeting their credentials as places for individual self-cultivation, natural history museums promoted themselves as institutions generating useful knowledge not least by advancing scholarly and scientific inquiries. Most importantly, however, advocates drew on widespread idealistic notions of *Bildung* and claimed that studying nature furthered a 'firm belief in an all-encompassing divine spirit that abides by immutable laws' (p. 71). As these museums positioned themselves as public institutions of *Bildung*, the question arose as to for whom these establishments were being maintained. Before the last third of the nineteenth century, it was the upper and solid middle classes that visited displays. Often, they took to museums on public holidays, turning tours into 'festive occasions' for the family (p. 127). Kretschmann notes that the collections were not necessarily the sole draw. Towards the century's close, the new sumptuous buildings with their ornate, light-filled courtyards, balconies, and broad staircases functioned as lavish stages for social interaction and representation on the part of the visitors. Moreover, museums promised 'mass experiences' by bringing together large numbers of people as well as by thrilling visitors through the plethora of objects on display.

Strategies of display increasingly occupied museum managers from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. First of all, museum staff faced the challenge of presenting ever-expanding collections for the benefit of a public that was only vaguely acquainted with recent scientific findings. Some shows suffered from considerable and protracted neglect, leaving exhibits covered in dust and without labels. To deal with difficulties of display arising from an overabundance of artefacts, curators began to organize the bulk of objects into study collections, which researchers could consult. These remained separate from display collections that began to introduce the public to a select range of objects in the 1880s. The various museums adopted different approaches to educate their audiences through their display collections. Berlin's natural history museum opted for a rather dry taxonomical display that reflected predominant scientific classification schemes. By contrast, the Senckenberg Museum in Frankfurt

offered 'a historical tour of life forms' (p. 219) from single-cell organisms to mammals accentuated by visual highlights including 'star' objects and ensembles such as a gorilla and a lion family. The Senckenberg Museum aimed to tell stories, an approach that proved considerably more successful in attracting visitors. In 1907, 75,000 people visited the Senckenberg Museum while the collection in Berlin attracted fewer than 60,000 visitors annually. The star among the museums Kretschmann considers was the one in Bremen with its mix of natural history, ethnography, and trade commodities: it counted over 240,000 annual visitors before the Great War.

The changing composition of visitors was the second factor that made museum directors rethink their exhibitions. With the consolidation of an industrial society, urban workers began to take advantage of the fact that they could enter natural history museums for free. Museum staff took into consideration the educational backgrounds of these new visitors. The circumstance that workers' cultural expectations were shaped by a developing commercial mass culture also left an imprint on display practices seeking to instruct *and* entertain. According to Kretschmann, the growing attendance of workers indirectly imported a predilection for the spectacular into museum displays, rendering collections more accessible. While it remains unclear how workers assessed the glass cases full of rocks, shells, stuffed animals, and, in Bremen, ethnographic objects, museum officials seized the opportunity to portray their institutions as educational establishments that, by attracting working-class patrons, supported broader efforts at social reform and thus contributed to defusing social tensions.

Kretschmann's book provides intriguing insights into the development of museum practices throughout the nineteenth century. This is a conscientious book whose author forbids himself unsubstantiated speculations on subjects such as audience reactions when his source material yields no convincing clues. As the work's strength rests in its painstaking reconstruction of a host of biographies and institutional transformations, it would have benefited from a more assertive conceptual approach. While Kretschmann retraces convincingly how natural history museums characterized themselves as institutions of *Bildung*, he does not fully explore to what extent these claims were accepted outside museum circles. The discussion conducted in Bremen's educational ministry about which

Book Reviews

schools were allowed to include museum visits in their curricula could have been employed to pursue this issue further. What does it say about the status of a natural history museum as well as science in general when the local *Gymnasium* was banned from making a day at the natural history museum a part of its curriculum while the *Volkschulen* were encouraged to do just that?

Moreover, Kretschmann's enticing suggestion that natural history museums offered epistemic orientation for a society undergoing rapid transformation remains regrettably isolated in the introduction and conclusion. Had it been integrated more consistently and more concretely into the analysis, this theme could have provided a very fruitful approach, since much of the knowledge that natural history museums embody has been subject to fundamental critiques in recent work on cultural and ecological imperialism. Of course, the point is not to replicate such inquiries against one's own instincts, and Kretschmann seems to have a good deal of sympathy for the institutions that he studies. Still, it is not sufficient to skirt around a large body of work that has posed problems to the history of nineteenth-century scientific knowledge in general and natural history museums in particular in recent years. Here, Kretschmann misses an opportunity to challenge, or to push forward, existing inquiries. As a result, the reader of this book abounding with empirical findings sometimes feels like some visitors to nineteenth-century natural history museums may well have done: intrigued, but also, at times, a little lost amid a mass of interesting details and facts.

BERNHARD RIEGER teaches European history at University College London. He is the author of *Technology and the Culture of Modernity in Britain and Germany, 1890–1945* (2005) and is currently working on a global history of the Volkswagen Beetle.

SHULAMIT VOLKOV, *Germans, Jews, and Antisemites: Trials in Emancipation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), xiii + 311 pp. ISBN-13: 978 0 521 846882 1. ISBN-10: 0 521 84688 9. £40.00 US \$70.00 (hardback)

Shulamit Volkov has produced more instructive pieces on the history of the German Jews than virtually any other historian. She has always seen Jewish history as an integral part of German history, though without regarding this as its only interpretation. In some respects her most recent book is a synthesis of her previous work, and therefore deserves particular attention. Her starting point is the fact that only a few German Jews foresaw the catastrophe of the Holocaust. According to Volkov, this has much to do with specific characteristics of German Judaism which in any case, she suggests, remains quite incomprehensible without its historical roots.

There had been no shortage of warning signs. The lives of German Jews were marked by anti-Semitic experiences, and they knew all about the prejudices of the majority Christian society. Yet the progressive, liberal Jews regarded anti-Semitism as a relic of the past which they no longer considered to have any social power. Many Zionists, on the other hand, sought to come to terms with anti-Semitism and, at the same time, to hold fast to their faith in their own future. This attitude was crucially influenced by the experience of anti-Semitic violence that occurred increasingly in eastern Europe after the assassination of Alexander II in 1881. According to Volkov, this also applied to the figurehead of turn-of-the-century Zionism, Theodor Herzl, who, for political reasons, stylized the Dreyfus affair into the key event of his life. In fact, she says, the treatment of eastern European Jews in Karl Lueger's Vienna had already convinced him of the need, in principle, for a solution to the 'Jewish question'.

Volkov demonstrates extreme sensitivity towards the ambivalent attitudes of her protagonists towards Judaism. Thus she says of Sigmund Freud, who fought all his life for psychoanalysis to be accepted in the university world and was well prepared to compromise over conventions: 'A member of the first generation of emancipation, Freud apparently felt more comfortable among Jews than among non-Jews' (p. 39). Her judgement of Franz Kafka, who left no doubt as to his Jewish identity despite apparently rejecting Judaism, is even more pointed: 'He always counts himself among the Jews he

Book Reviews

so heartily despises' (p. 41). Yet however well developed the art of introspection was in the Jews, most of them retained an affirmative and idealistic attitude towards German culture. Significantly, the international Jewish press reached a harsh condemnatory verdict on Hitler when it compared him to the tsar—a judgement that did not even begin to do justice to the horrors that lay ahead. At the same time there was no shortage of Zionists who saw Hitler, above all, as confirmation of their own anti-assimilatory view of the world.

Volkov's most successful research strategy is her concept of anti-Semitism as a cultural code, which makes Clifford Geertz's ideas useful for historical research. Here she is reacting to the fact that in most academic works the connection is rarely successfully made between the anti-Semitism of the Kaiserreich and that of the Third Reich. In most cases, she says, the authors are content to illustrate the roots of National Socialism in the *völkisch* movement. According to Volkov, however, the specific nature and virulence of anti-Semitism cannot be explained simply by positing continuity. She disputes, for example, whether the racial doctrines of the anti-Semites in the Kaiserreich were really so important in terms of the history of ideology. At any rate, one pioneer of the *völkisch* movement, Paul de Lagarde, had considered racism a meaningless variety of materialism. And, she maintains, the importance of Julius Langbehn for the history of ideology lies not in his strangely indifferent anti-Semitism but in his variety of cultural criticism, which seemed modern to his contemporaries and took into account the value of the artistic individual as opposed to the anonymous forces of the era.

Volkov makes various desiderata for research on anti-Semitism quite clear. She feels, for example, that we know far too little about the significance of the 1848–9 revolution, so often celebrated as the 'people's spring' and zenith of the democratic movement, for the history of anti-Semitism. During the revolution there were numerous acts of anti-Semitic violence and the Hamburg journalist Wilhelm Marr, in whose circle the expression 'anti-Semitism' came to prominence in the decade of the Reich's foundation, was himself a failed member of the 1848 generation. According to Volkov, at a methodological level it has not been possible to bring research on nationalism and on anti-Semitism closer to one another, as can also be seen in the works of leading general historians such as Hans-Ulrich Wehler and Thomas Nipperdey. Despite all attempts by German historians

to do justice to modern anti-Semitism, there are clear signs of reluctance. As an example Volkov points out that there are reservations about the Jews in Social Democracy. So far they have played only a marginal part in research on the history of the labour movement. From a methodological point of view it is important to remember that the majority of anti-Semites in the Kaiserreich relied on the power of the written word. Established academics such as Paul de Lagarde and Heinrich von Treitschke should therefore be regarded as particularly disastrous since they lent bourgeois respectability to hatred of the Jews by giving full expression to their resentment. At the same time, she says, it should also be borne in mind that the culture of the book represented 'the real homeland of the Jews' (George Steiner), from which they could not easily be expelled (p. 153).

Another key area of Shulamit Volkov's work is the German-Jewish project of modernity. Like Uriel Tal she underlines the exclusive character of the German nation-state, whose advocates were keen to establish inner homogeneity. Thus Theodor Mommsen, as a convinced left liberal, was among the energetic champions of minority rights and believed in the importance of Judaism for the cultural history of humanity. Nonetheless, he saw it as unavoidable that the Jews, in order to be 'accepted into one great nation', would have to give up their collective identity. Volkov's sympathies are with de Tocqueville's pluralistic concept of democracy, which allows for individual political decisions. Yet it is surely telling that his way of thinking was alien to most politicians in the German Kaiserreich.

The speed and social range of the Jewish assimilation process varied considerably. The society that prided itself so much on its openness actually contained many patterns of exclusion. At the universities there were many gifted Jewish students and *Privatdozenten*, but very few of them ever became professors. Volkov underlines the positive aspects of such discrimination, which mainly consisted in the fact that in expanding disciplines such as medicine Jews were forced into rapidly emerging sub-branches, where they were able to make pioneering discoveries despite being in a marginal discipline. Given the present state of knowledge, it is difficult to say to what extent Jews were also forced into 'creative niches' in the humanities. In any case, the conformity of outsiders should be taken into account which, in 'national disciplines' such as German studies and history, was quite considerable. What is certain is that perfect command of the

Book Reviews

German language was the *conditio sine qua non* (p. 187) for social advancement, which Volkov describes as a process of successfully becoming bourgeois. The social changes entailed a high level of visibility. Both the degree of urbanization of the German Jews and their low birth rates were often seen within the Jewish community as crisis phenomena. Today these social parameters are viewed less dramatically as evidence of the specific modernity of German Judaism.

In terms of the history of mentalities, the German Jews' most striking characteristic was certainly the value they attached to education. This is one of the main reasons why Jewish women played such a pioneering role in the education system. But the eagerness of Jewish pupils to learn was also regarded as exemplary, and even embittered anti-Semites could not ignore the success of Jewish academics. In the first forty years of the twentieth century, for instance, one-third of German Nobel laureates were of Jewish extraction. Precisely because they knew all about the frictions within an extremely hierarchical education system, they early developed a will to achieve and this helped them to overcome difficulties and setbacks. 'Good is bad' (p. 237) was an expression common during their schooldays, meaning that only Jews with excellent achievements had an academic future. Of course, they paid a high price for their academic ambitions.

Volkov is extremely sensitive to the darker side of the much-revered German-Jewish culture. Orientated primarily by the cultural mainstream, German Jews, she says, also paid their respects to intellectual trends that had little sense of difference or dissent. This applies as much to their attitude towards romanticism as to diverse forms of nationalism. She says that only very few German scholars, such as Moritz Lazarus, had a positive view of cultural diversity, which made positive defence of their Jewish identity possible. Volkov takes the historian Harry Bresslau and the philosopher Hermann Cohen, who stressed the exemplary character of Germanness, particularly severely to task. It should be borne in mind here, of course, that 'German' was also an ideal concept conceived by Fichte that was meant to serve as a yardstick for the present and also contained a promise for the future.

The determining forces in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries turned out to have a different effect from what most of the leading intellectuals among the highly acculturated German Jews thought. Both the experience of anti-Semitism and the successful

process of assimilation favoured, in the medium-term, the dissimilation of German Jews. Culturally, however, Volkov says, the renaissance of Judaism was far more strongly influenced by German culture than would appear at first glance in the essentialist discourses of the *fin de siècle*. In this context Volkov refers back to Martin Buber's *Chassidische Geschichten*, which claimed the greatest authenticity but proved to be literary testimonies very much characteristic of their own time.

In terms of content, however, Shulamit Volkov is interested not in meting out ideological criticism but in a better understanding of the German Jews who, with their eagerness for education and faith in normative values, appear exemplary and helpless in equal measure. In Kantian terms, they were incapable of guaranteeing the conditions for their own success. It is telling that the book ends with a tragic image: the German Jews lived on a ship that was bound to sink, yet continued to dream the dream of peaceful co-existence. Even if this is just an illusion, there can be little doubt about the inner value of this vision—and its cultural productivity.

ULRICH SIEG is Professor at the University of Marburg and is currently teaching as a DAAD exchange professor at McGill University. He specializes in the history of political ideas, the history of science and universities in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and Jewish history from Imperial Germany to the Weimar Republic. Among his publications are *Jüdische Intellektuelle im Ersten Weltkrieg* (2001) and, most recently, *Deutschlands Prophet: Paul de Lagarde und die Ursprünge des modernen Antisemitismus* (2007).

MAGNUS BRECHTKEN, *Scharnierzeit 1895–1907: Persönlichkeitsnetze und internationale Politik in den deutsch-britisch-amerikanischen Beziehungen vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz/Abteilung für Universalgeschichte, 195 (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2006), xvii + 454 pp. EUR 73.90

In this book Magnus Brechtken examines relations between the USA, Britain, and Germany before the First World War. It is not a classical political history, however, but something like a cultural history of international diplomacy. Brechtken describes trilateral—or, to be more precise, a series of complementary bilateral—relations during this period, mainly at the level of second-rank diplomats such as Cecil Spring Rice and Henry White. Foreign policy is not observed from the viewpoint of the ‘great men’, heads of government and foreign ministers, but from the less visible perspective of the diplomatic networks and the cultural and personal level of friends, acquaintances, social intercourse, and communities based on a common interest. The term *Scharnierzeit* (hinge period) is unusual. Brechtken uses it to suggest that in 1895 the future of relations between the three Great Powers was still open, while by the end of the period the fundamental constellations in international politics that had emerged were not to change again until the outbreak of the First World War. The idea here is that an alliance between the USA, Britain, and Germany could have been one possible way of preventing the catastrophe. This is an interesting train of thought, but it should be pointed out that any such alliance between the three industrially most advanced states of the time was never even discussed. At most, they maintained bilateral relations on individual questions.

Brechtken provides a number of excellent and sympathetic sketches, particularly when he describes the close political and personal relations between British and American diplomats, and investigates cultural influences, reciprocal marriages, and social intercourse. He analyses the British and American political style, and then works out the differences between it and the German model, referring often to the irritating speeches and actions of Wilhelm II. In the case of Britain and the US in particular, Brechtken provides a highly interesting, readable, and convincing mixture of description and analysis in presenting the political culture. For Britain he investigates

a generation of diplomats which, in terms of age and position, he regards as a counterpart to the German *Wilhelminer*. These British diplomats had no time or sympathy for Germany, whose unification and rise had taken place in their lifetimes. They decided to seek agreement with the US while at the same time not trying to avoid a 'confrontation on security' (p. 375) with Germany.

Brechtken's sketches, however, do not merge together into a true overall picture. One reason for this is that he investigates individuals and incidents in great detail, but not the foreign policy ensemble. Moreover, his concept of a *Scharnierzeit* is deterministic: it operates with a knowledge of future outcomes. The restriction to the period 1895 to 1905 is questionable. Why does the investigation not begin in 1890, or 1871? Why does it not end in 1914, or 1917? For German-American relations it could be argued that the turning point came after the war began in 1914, and that until then, things were in flux. Perhaps the point of no return came only with the start of submarine warfare. Another problem is that many of the foreign policy developments depicted here did not originate in relations between the three states, but influenced them, and a trilateral investigation finds it difficult to deal with this. The justification for the boundaries of the *Scharnierzeit* lies in the field of international politics. The other powers equally involved, such as France, Russia, and Japan, are excluded from the study, although Brechtken defines the beginning and end points of his *Scharnierzeit* in terms of their actions (Chinese-Japanese war of 1895; Anglo-Russian agreement of 1907). From the British perspective in particular, which forms one of the main axes of the study, Russia and India could have been as significant as the factors investigated here. Brechtken does not deny this and it comes up repeatedly in his book, but it does not help to make the concept of the *Scharnierzeit* any more plausible.

The basic idea of this book is best summed up by a cartoon which is reproduced on the book's dust jacket and again on p. 346. Its source is *The Times* of 4 June 1909, and it shows a small, crying John Bull being frightened by another boy of the same size – Germany – wearing a scary mask of Wilhelm II's face, and running to a considerably larger boy wearing stars-and-stripes trousers. The caption reads: 'Boohoo – I want my big brother.' This cartoon expresses one of the main ideas behind this study: Britain sought and found American help against an arrogant and overbearing Wilhelmine Germany.

Book Reviews

Brechtken's study is complex and sometimes meanders. It covers themes as diverse as networking, education, worldviews, career patterns, and mental maps in the three states. The true structural principle of the work may be seen as the situation analysis of the British elites and the options for action open to them against the background of their political, cultural, and personal preferences. Why did they decide to be indulgent towards the US, while not avoiding confrontation with Germany? Niall Ferguson has asked similar questions, and his answers suggest that the sheer size of, and danger posed by, opponents was significant. In this view, coming to terms with other powers, such as France, Russia, and the US, simply seemed a more urgent necessity for maintaining the British Empire than coming to an understanding with Germany.

Brechtken's idea of taking politics out of its abstract framework, investigating its cultural background, and examining the significance of networks was good. He presents a number of affectionate and thorough detailed studies which, in an interesting and readable way, deal with 'culture' and fundamental issues of the British mentality and its impact on foreign policy. The footnotes, which are mostly very long, contain further stimulating ideas and information. A large number of well-chosen images and illustrations, sensibly integrated into the text, increase the pleasure of reading this book. The concept of this study is not convincing, but its wealth of detail is. I thoroughly recommend it to readers interested in British or American diplomacy before 1914, or in a cultural history of international politics.

HOLGER AFFLERBACH is Chair of Central European History in the School of History, University of Leeds. He is the author of a biography of Erich von Falkenhayn, a study of the Triple Alliance, an edition on Wilhelm II as Supreme Warlord, and several other books, mainly on the history of international politics before 1914 and the First World War. He is currently working on a history of surrender.

FRANK McDONOUGH, *The Conservative Party and Anglo-German Relations, 1905–1914* (Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), ix + 201 pp. ISBN 978 0 230 51711 0. £45.00

JOHN RAMSDEN, *Don't Mention the War: The British and the Germans since 1890* (London: Little, Brown, 2006), xiv + 433 pp. ISBN 978 0 316 86122 9. £20.00

The Edwardian era in Britain and the Wilhelmine period in Germany were key to the shaping of British–German relations in the twentieth century. Until recently the dominant narrative has been that of a seemingly unstoppable rise of antagonism between the late 1890s and 1914 combined with the notion that the First World War was fought as a ‘war of ideas’, as the Oxford classicist Alfred Zimmern put it in the summer of 1914: ‘a conflict between two different and irreconcilable conceptions of government, society and progress.’ That view was most brilliantly and extensively argued by Paul Kennedy in his hugely influential study, *The Rise of the Anglo-German Antagonism*, published in 1980.

Few historians have questioned that British–German relations did, indeed, worsen rapidly in the course of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This deterioration found expression in the naval arms race and various diplomatic quarrels, and eventually ended in the armed conflict of the Great War. According to this narrative the mutual images of Germany and Britain darkened steadily until 1918. Germany, in the eyes of British contemporaries, changed from an economically backward, territorially fragmented, but intellectually outstanding collection of statelets into an economic giant, potential military opponent, and political great power which needed to be watched carefully. Britain, on the other hand, was increasingly viewed by Germans as a country that had transformed itself from a wartime ally during the Napoleonic wars and a model of liberal politics into the home of the materialist *Krämergeist*, which contrasted unfavourably with German idealism and heroism.

This changed image on the British side used to be blamed largely on the Conservative Party, which has often been portrayed as consisting primarily of anti-German scaremongers who, whether in connection with trade rivalry, the naval arms race, foreign policy, or conscription, allegedly reacted to the Reich in an extremely hostile fashion that contributed considerably to the growth of British–German

Book Reviews

antagonism. In his study, *The Conservative Party and Anglo-German Relations*, Frank McDonough, reader in international history at Liverpool John Moores University, calls this characterization a 'myth' which must be 'seriously discussed and re-evaluated by scholars' (p. 138). He argues that Conservative attitudes towards Germany, while the party was in opposition between 1905 and 1914, showed a much higher level of moderation than hitherto thought.

The Conservative case for tariff reform, for example, McDonough claims, was not connected specifically to the German commercial threat, but concentrated instead 'on the intransigence of free trade liberals who opposed the policy' (p. 14). Germany – and its fiscal system in particular – was depicted as a role model. Everyday life in the Reich was, accordingly, portrayed in positive terms. Moreover, even the naval race did not figure as prominently in the Conservative chamber of horrors as could be assumed. A close examination of Conservative speeches on this topic at Westminster demonstrates, according to McDonough, that hostile comments about Germany were 'surprisingly few and far between' (p. 73). Instead, Conservatives used very mild language when discussing British–German naval questions. Again, most Conservatives turned their criticism on the Liberal government for failing to maintain naval supremacy. On the question of conscription, the author argues that there was, indeed, widespread approval for compulsory military service within the party rank and file. This enthusiasm, however, was held in check by the more realistic and down-to-earth view of the party leadership, which opposed conscription because it feared its unpopularity at the ballot box.

In any case, foreign policy was formulated neither by the party rank and file nor by the shadow cabinet, party political press, or the lower tiers of functionaries, but within an exclusive inner circle around the party leaders Arthur Balfour (up to 1911) and Andrew Bonar Law (1911–14). This narrow circle did not change much over the time covered by McDonough; it consisted of foreign policy and naval experts such as Lord Lansdowne and Lord Selborne. Its outstanding aim, McDonough argues, was to maintain a bipartisan consensus on foreign policy issues and to insulate foreign policy from the domestic political struggle. The Conservative leadership was determined to avoid giving offence to the German government in order to support the publicly restrained attitude towards the Reich which the Liberal foreign secretary, Sir Edward Grey, had adopted.

If there was public hostility towards Germany, the author maintains, it was voiced only on the lunatic fringes of Conservative politics, or within patriotic pressure groups such as the National Service League and the Imperial Maritime League, which had little or no direct connection with the party's top ranks. Outright enmity and hatred, McDonough writes, was 'the preserve of those without any real influence over the Conservative leadership, without any political responsibility and was predominantly an extra-parliamentary phenomenon' (p. 126).

With regard to the July crisis of 1914, McDonough convincingly demonstrates that the Conservative leadership supported British intervention to prevent the destruction of France by Germany, and not because of the violation of Belgian neutrality, which was the crucial issue for British public opinion and for maintaining unity within the Liberal Cabinet: 'The leadership of the Conservative Party gave wholehearted support to Grey not on the basis they supported everything he did, but on the understanding that Grey would use the Anglo-French Entente to uphold the balance of power in Europe' (p. 143).

McDonough advances his revisionist argument boldly and persuasively. He has perused a vast amount of source material, including the private papers of most senior Conservative politicians, parliamentary speeches and committee minutes, and hundreds of articles in newspapers and periodicals. There remain, however, some doubts and open questions. Is it useful to separate moderate public pronouncements from privately voiced anxieties as strictly as McDonough suggests? Why should the former necessarily be more important or authentic than the latter? Can one really dismiss the patriotic pressure groups as a 'loony right' with 'very limited impact' (p. 138)? They were, after all, one of the defining features of the era, as McDonough himself admits. They might have had problems persuading Balfour to change course, but they certainly helped in his downfall as party leader. The same is true for the Conservative mass press. They might have been held at arm's length by the party leaders, but they shaped the media environment and public atmosphere in which any politician in the Edwardian era had to perform. Their impact might have been indirect, but it was profound, nevertheless. The January 1910 election campaign, which McDonough analyses, is a case in point.

Book Reviews

Finally, when it comes to the 'real' reasons for the Anglo-German antagonism, the author falls back on naval arms competition and Germany's challenge to British maritime superiority. This is not only a rather conventional argument for a revisionist study but also a questionable one. There is, after all, mounting evidence provided by naval historians such as Jon Sumida, Nicholas Lambert, and Rolf Hobson that the German threat was not nearly as vital for British maritime armament as the Admiralty claimed at the time and historians continued to believe for a long time since. That said, there is still much profit to be had from McDonough's thorough and thought-provoking investigation, which questions a crucial element of our conventional view of British-German relations in the early twentieth century.

The second study reviewed here does not challenge mainstream historiography but rather reinforces the master narrative of the Anglo-German antagonism. In his book on the British view of Germany in the 'long' twentieth century from the 1890s to the present day, John Ramsden, professor at Queen Mary's in London, explores material ranging widely from politics to high and popular culture, and sports and travel. Relying mainly on secondary literature and published sources, the author deals as authoritatively with party policy, government memoranda, and court life as with classical music, architecture, theatre, serious literature, spy thrillers, the tabloid media, television, and the film industry.

In his first chapter, entitled 'An amiable, unselfish, kindly people', he traces British perceptions of Germany before 1900, stressing British admiration for German scholarship and music (especially Richard Wagner), the celebration of a common Anglo-Saxon heritage, dynastic links, and the slightly amused, but mainly benevolent tone of British travel writing on Germany. The reasons why most of this changed around the turn of the century do not seem to interest Ramsden as much as the public impact and the forms in which the turn-around in images and stereotypes was expressed. *Don't Mention the War* is a decidedly culturalist study, if not in the methodology adopted (of which there is little anyway), then at least in its focus on ideas and beliefs rather than on socio-economic structures or political facts.

The emphasis on popular perceptions explains why two important opinion-formers take centre stage in chapters 2 and 3, which deal

with the years 1900 to 1914 and the Great War respectively. In Ramsden's view, William Le Queux, a popular and prolific writer of bestselling spy scare stories and invasion tales, personifies the Edwardian era with its nervous anxiety about German diplomatic machinations, industrial prowess, and military might. His successful cooperation with Lord Northcliffe, the most powerful newspaper baron of his age, also demonstrates the degree to which Edwardian Britain had become a media society in which stories in the press mattered almost as much as political decisions by government officials. This is why Ramsden suggests that Le Queux's anti-German scare-mongering effectively 'helped to revolutionise British ideas: an Anglo-German war that seemed utterly fantastic in 1890 became inescapable in 1914' (p. 58). To underline Le Queux's popularity with readers from all social backgrounds, Ramsden mentions that the writer was not only 'Queen Alexandra's favourite author' but also among the authors most widely purchased by public libraries, with twenty-eight titles per library in 1907 (p. 58).

Unfortunately, this is one of the rather rare occasions on which Ramsden explicitly deals with questions of reception, which are notoriously difficult to handle but crucial to the kind of history he intends to write. Generally, he is not interested in reception theories and offers no in-depth examination of the specific social or political milieux in which anti-German images were constructed and spread. Accordingly, his treatment of Rudyard Kipling as the very epitome of hatred of all things German during the First World War mainly relies on quotations from Kipling's poems and other writings. Ramsden states that Kipling's appeal rested on two factors: 'the easy accessibility of his verse, as comprehensible as music-hall lyrics; and the broad acceptance of his attitudes among middle-class readers'. However, he offers no supporting evidence for this apart from a remark by George Orwell that Kipling both reflected and shaped opinion for two generations (p. 91).

Ramsden does not confine his study to the years up to 1918, although the reader gains the impression that British mental pictures of Germany never completely recuperated from the defining period between 1900 and the end of the First World War. To be sure, there were periods of amelioration and relaxation of tension, such as the 1920s which, in Ramsden's interpretation, were personified by the economist John Maynard Keynes, a 'Germanophile from childhood'

Book Reviews

(p. 135), and strident critic of Germany's harsh treatment in the Versailles Peace Treaty. Nevertheless, by the end of the decade, even Keynes had been converted to Alfred Zimmern's view of 1914. This was not a war between nationalism and imperialism, he claimed in December 1939, 'but between two opposed ways of life and over what we are to mean by civilization' (p. 174).

Ramsden is right to point out that anti-German feeling in the Second World War never reached the same heights as in 1914–18. He also convincingly argues that at government level bilateral relations improved from the early to mid-1960s onwards. In Ramsden's view, this was partly because of the gradual disappearance of veterans of the Western front of 1914–18, who had dominated all cabinets from 1940 to 1963. Their successors, who had gained their military experience in the Second World War, 'took a less deterministic view of Germans' (p. 266), which might have had something to do with the fact that their generation did not suffer as many casualties as their fathers had in the Great War (Margaret Thatcher, who had not fought against Germany in the war but experienced the Battle of Britain as a civilian, was the exception to prove that rule).

Whereas before 1945 government policy and popular attitudes largely went hand in hand, they sharply diverged thereafter. Ramsden hints at a lost opportunity to overcome mutual hostilities between the German and British peoples in the immediate postwar period, when mistrust and scepticism still prevailed at government level. In those years, when the West German economic miracle was not yet in full swing, Ramsden argues, ordinary Britons were astonishingly friendly or at least less biased than before or since towards their former enemies across the North Sea. Some 6 per cent of German POWs decided to stay in Britain. One of them, Bert Trautmann, even became a national hero as the Manchester City goal keeper who, in 1956, helped his team to win the FA Cup, although he had his neck broken in the final match. In his chapter on Germans in British war films in the 1950s, Ramsden draws an astonishingly reassuring picture, stating that 'cinema in the 1950s both mirrored public opinion and helped to push it in a positive direction' (p. 324).

The author is less clear, however, on why the British view of the Germans did not further improve from the 1960s onwards; or rather, why it got worse. There are many possible culprits. 'Popular literature, invasion tales, television, children's books and history courses,

as well as the xenophobic lead given by politicians and newspapers, all contributed to the popular mindset' (p. 364). The most fascinating explanation that Ramsden offers describes Germanophobia from the 1960s or 1970s onwards as increasingly an English obsession, rather than the British preoccupation that it had been in 1915 or even as recently as 1950. The Scots and Welsh could still revert to their older regional identities once the British Empire had dissolved. For the English, however, as the dominant nation within the British Isles 'no local "other" easily offered itself'; only 'history could produce one' (p. 366). Unfortunately, Ramsden mentions this thesis in passing but does not really explore it. His study is admirably researched, well-meaning, and fun to read, but sometimes overloaded with details, quotations, and anecdotes, and lacking analytical precision and interpretative vigour.

In their different ways, McDonough's and Ramsden's studies represent the challenges which historians working on British-German relations in the twentieth century face today. There is a growing awareness that the old antagonism paradigm does not suffice to explain the complexities of cultural affinities, intellectual cross-fertilizations, and social links which connected the two countries and which shaped relations as much as the better-known enmities and rivalries. An alternative master narrative, however, that combines both mutual admiration and hostility has yet to be established. A German journalist commenting on Queen Elizabeth's state visit to Germany in 1965 – the first such visit since 1907 – summed it up nicely when he wrote that 'in recent times no relations between peoples have been more deeply disturbed . . . and this precisely because there was so much sympathy, so much wooing, willingness to understand, even admiration involved on both sides. The pain of disappointment corresponded to the degree of previously nurtured expectations.'

DOMINIK GEPPERT, previously a Research Fellow of the GHIL, is *Privatdozent* at the Free University of Berlin. In 2007/8 he is Acting Professor at the University of Marburg. He is the author of *Die Ära Adenauer* (2002) and *Thatchers konservative Revolution: Der Richtungswandel der britischen Tories 1975–1979* (2002). His most recent publication is *'Pressekriege': Öffentlichkeit und Diplomatie in den deutsch-britischen Beziehungen 1896–1912* (2007).

ROLAND HILL, *A Time Out of Joint: A Journey from Nazi Germany to Post-War Britain* (London: The Radcliffe Press, 2007), xvii + 325 pp. ISBN 978 1 84511 495 4. £27.50

In late July 1939, on a blazing summer's day, the then 19-year-old Roland Hess arrived alone at London's Victoria Station, a five pound note and a few introductions in his pocket and with a passport stamped 'Refugee from Nazi Oppression'. By the outbreak of war in September 1939, more than 74,000 Germans and Austrians had fled their respective countries and found shelter in Britain, bewildered and uprooted, often barely able to communicate in the language of their host country, and in many cases without any means or support from friends. They were united in their opposition to a ruthless dictatorship and grateful to a liberal and tolerant society whose generosity had literally saved their lives. Refugees from other European countries, one after the other occupied by Hitler's advancing armies, were soon to follow them.

Over many decades now, historians and social scientists have analysed and described practically every aspect of their shameful exodus, whose monstrous nature failed to stir and unite world opinion in protest. Historical research has produced a glittering array of studies that not only depict extensively the tragedy, the hardships, and deprivations countless individuals had to suffer, but in their entirety make an impressive memorial for posterity to celebrate the achievements and the political and moral values of a distinctive group of people who were early victims of totalitarian despotism.

Hill's memoirs are probably among the last witness accounts by one of those thousands of emigrants from Central Europe to be published during their lifetime. They conjure up a biography, indeed shared by many others, which mirrors the irrationalities, cruelties, and aberrations of the twentieth century – a time 'out of joint' as the author rightly sees it from his perspective. At the beginning of the twenty-first century most of the once numerous 'Continental Britons' (Marion Berghahn) have passed away. Their descendants have been absorbed by British society and lost any trace of the legendary 'refugee English' of their parents and grandparents. The bus conductor calling 'Schweizer Hütte' instead of 'Swiss Cottage' in the late 1930s (an often told anecdote) has since entered London's unique and continuous history of welcoming immigrants and exiled foreigners.

And who would, or could, enjoy a joke today, asks Hill, that sixty or seventy years ago amused refugees from Central Europe and Londoners alike: the gasman rings a Hampstead doorbell and, when the door is opened, says: 'I have come to see the meter.' Continental housewife: 'I am the Mieter.'

Hess, soon Roland Hill, came to Britain on a student visa. A sort of odyssey, not untypical for many emigrants from Central Europe in the 1930s, already lay behind him. He outlines it in the first part of his memoirs, without bitterness or anger, but wondering, in retrospect, about his curiosity and the nonchalance that characterized his attitude towards the hardships and uncertainties of forced exile in countries he had never visited before. Hill describes his childhood in Hamburg and his fairly comfortable family background in great detail. Soon after Hitler's fateful 'seizure of power', Hill's family left Hamburg, first for Prague, then Vienna, where his father tried to restart his business and his Austrian-born mother to pursue her career as an opera singer, and where young Roland converted to Catholicism and discovered journalism. From then on he considered Austria, where he spent his formative years, his spiritual home. However, the country did not turn out to be a safe haven from Nazi persecution, and so the family split up. In late 1938 Hill's mother moved with her only son to Milan, while his father escaped to Switzerland without an official permit, in the desperate hope of being able to earn a living there. The author's decision to leave Italy for Britain was taken when he received a request, not long after his arrival in the city, to present himself for military service at the German consulate in Milan.

Hill's subsequent life and experiences in wartime England were shared by many of those refugees who were lucky enough to escape Hitler's Gestapo: internment as an 'enemy alien' on the Isle of Man and in Canada; after being released, service in the Pioneer Corps of the British Army and later with the Highland Light Infantry under Montgomery's 21st Army Group, taking part in the Normandy landings and the European campaign; and finally as a press officer with the British occupation forces in Germany. After demobilization Hill read History and Philosophy at King's College London and was soon offered an apprenticeship on the Catholic weekly, the *Tablet*, founded in 1840. Work with that established journal laid the solid foundations for Hill's distinguished career in journalism. Now, at last, the

Book Reviews

turbulent history of the twentieth century paid off for Hill in having enhanced his linguistic skills and made him feel at home in four countries, namely Britain, Germany, Austria, and Italy, the latter also the native country of his late wife. Hill wrote successfully for papers in all these countries, but he was best known for his work as the London correspondent for the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* from 1957 and *Die Presse* of Vienna. It says a great deal about the impact Hill's extensive journalism, his professionalism, and personal charm had on readers and colleagues in Britain, Germany, and elsewhere that, in the 1980s, he was elected President of the Foreign Press Association in Britain.

There are still many people who remember Roland Hill as a respected, knowledgeable, and cosmopolitan correspondent, a pillar of London's journalistic fraternity. He covered the British political and cultural scene under seven prime ministers, from Winston Churchill to Margaret Thatcher. However, his wide circle of colleagues and friends also know that he is an excellent historian in his own right. His well-researched biography of Lord Acton, published in English in 2000 and in a German version shortly afterwards, was favourably received by the press and academia.

Now in retirement and still a sharp commentator on current affairs, particularly European politics and developments in the Catholic Church, Hill's memoirs recall decades which Eric Hobsbawm labelled 'interesting times' a few years ago. 'Interesting' is an adjective Roland Hill would certainly not mind being used to describe his own life experiences. However, he would be quick to add 'tragic', and for very good reason. His family was destroyed when he was still a schoolboy, his beloved grandparents and other relatives perishing in the Holocaust. The reader of his memoirs is deeply moved that despite everything that happened to him and his parents, he bears no grudge. Three-quarters of a century after his family was forced out of Hamburg and now looking back on his life from his home in peaceful Wimbledon, Hill can truly call himself a mediator between cultures and peoples. He is undisputedly someone who, in his lifetime, made a substantial contribution to the reconciliation and understanding between Britain and Germany, and his latest book is ample proof of that.

A Time Out of Joint

PETER ALTER is Emeritus Professor of Modern History at the University of Duisburg-Essen and a former Fellow of the GHIL. His most recent publication is *Winston Churchill (1874–1965): Leben und Überleben* (2006).

CONFERENCE REPORTS

Germany 1930–1990: Structures, Lived Experiences and Historical Representations, conference organized by the Centre for European Studies at University College London, held at the German Historical Institute London, 22–23 March 2007.

The aim of this conference was to explore how people of different social, generational, and political backgrounds sustained, lived through, and remembered the successive and contrasting regimes of the Third Reich, the Federal Republic, and the GDR. It also asked how historians should reconstruct and represent the continuities and contrasts in political structures, ideologies, and cultures of memory in Germany from 1930 to 1990.

The first session, chaired by Ian Kershaw (Sheffield), brought together presentations about approaches to history and cultures of memory. It was opened by the conference organizer, Mary Fulbrook (University College London), who spoke on 'History from Within: Structures, Lived Experiences, and Historical Representations'. Fulbrook presented thoughts on a new theoretical approach combining structure, agency, and individual experiences. The goal of this 'history from within' is to overcome the notion of history as a continuously evolving present and the dichotomy of 'intentions *v.* structures'. By tracing the 'social self' over time and thereby taking into account how people are formed by historical circumstances, the focus shifts towards the previously neglected intermediate stage, the 'structural and/or cultural availability for mobilization', irrespective of individual motives. Fulbrook argued that this approach prompts a revisiting of questions having to do with conformity, consent, and repression and the ways in which representations change across time.

Under the title '*Opfer austausch?*' Norbert Frei (Jena) discussed 'Recent Discourses on the Victims of Germans and on the Germans as Victims'. He argued that since 1990 and particularly in the last few years, Germany has experienced a shift in the way the Nazi past is debated. The decidedly critical, rational approach favoured by contemporaries of the Nazi period and the subsequent generation of 'learned contemporaries' who insisted on the *nie wieder* suddenly no

longer seems to be in fashion. Instead, Frei identified a need within the German population and the media to claim German victimhood. Frei cited the success of Jörg Friedrich's book *Der Brand*, films such as *Der Untergang*, and the popularity of TV series such as *Dresden* and *Die Flucht* as examples of this phenomenon and compared their success with the unpopularity of serious documentaries. In his opinion this shift is based on the fact that the interpretations of history increasingly follow the rules of the market where the main driving factors are entertainment and emotion.

Hanna Schissler's (Hanover) talk on '*Zeitgenossenschaft: Some Reflections on Contemporary German History*' stressed the importance of the present for the framing of historiography. She made the point that by establishing a culture of disconnectedness and 'objectivity', contemporary historians have avoided questioning their own underlying assumptions that influence their research. By comparing three academic cultures she demonstrated how the intellectual styles and common assumptions prevalent in each country impact the organization of research. She stated that in Germany, historians tackle 'the big questions' with a weight and seriousness hardly to be matched, but with a certain methodological conservatism. The German and Austrian historical communities are, furthermore, motivated by the idea of 'coming to terms with the past'. This splits the Austrian historians into two antagonistic camps, with one continuing to cultivate a dubious culture of victimhood and the other favouring a more critical approach. A wide variety of historical models, such as the emphasis on a sensitivity towards difference, such as race and gender, were in fact developed in the United States and have subsequently crossed over to Europe.

The second session, on repression, power, and ideology, was chaired by Andreas Gestrich (GHIL) and opened by Nick Stargardt (Oxford) speaking on 'The Problem of German Suffering in World War II: Crises of Morale and Morals'. Stargardt set out to examine what meanings Germans gave to their suffering and sacrifices during the war. He argued against the popular periodization of the defeat of the German army at Stalingrad as the major turning point after which the mood was supposedly defeatist and there was no more real support for the war among the German population. A real increase in terror took place only in the last three months of the war, when it was also used against German civilians. Focusing on the final two years

Conference Reports

of the war, Stargardt highlighted how the experience of total war helped to brutalize German society and brought it closer to Nazi core values, such as anti-Semitism, than ever before.

The following presentation by Jens Gieseke (BSTU, Berlin) was entitled 'Secret Police and Popular Opinion in a Closed Society: What Stasi Mood Reports Can (and Cannot) Tell'. Gieseke explored the value of mood reports as a historical source shedding light on the relationship of the SED with the majority of the population. During the period 1959 to 1989, the Stasi assembled between 500 and 1,400 reports, but only about fifteen of them tried to assess the general mood within the population at critical moments, such as the building of the Berlin Wall, the death of John F. Kennedy, or a crisis in the meat supply. The purpose of these reports was to reveal criticism or 'hostile' views toward the state from within the population. This was achieved essentially by spying on citizens and thus penetrating the private sphere. The mood reports record the politicization of a sense of 'abnormality' within the GDR population in terms of their circumstances and their critical attitudes towards issues such as the lack of democracy and freedom of movement.

In the evening, the conference participants had the opportunity to watch and discuss the premiere of the documentary *Behind the Wall: 'Perfectly Normal Lives' in the GDR?* by Mary Fulbrook and several of her research students. The film was followed by a discussion about whether the social and political processes of the 1960s and 1970s in the GDR can be described as 'normalization'.

The third session, entitled 'Functionaries, Regimes, and Everyday Life', opened the second day and was chaired by Thomas Lindenberger (ZZF Potsdam). Jill Stephenson (Edinburgh) began the session with a talk on 'Zealots, Incompetents, Foot-Draggers: Local Functionaries in the Third Reich'. Stephenson made the point that the general impression of total penetration of society by the Nazi party is misleading in the case of Württemberg. The Nazi party's goal of winning over the hearts and minds of the population could not be accomplished here as its grip on society in rural Württemberg was in some parts tenuous and in others non-existent. In spite of the enthusiasm of some NSDAP functionaries, there was a shortage of volunteers in the local branches to discharge the large number of centrally determined tasks. Additionally, the activists lacked certain skills necessary for leadership. The absence of competent people at the local level and

the regional tradition of having professionals in important offices ensured that the party and the government of the *Land* remained separate. Regional traditions often proved stronger than the newly imposed party rules.

Esther von Richthofen's (Berlin) presentation on 'Bending the Rules While Upholding the Structures: Functionaries and the Management of Cultural Life in the GDR' asked how power was exercised in the GDR, and which areas and structures of autonomy were created by the people themselves within these structures. Richthofen showed how from the mid-1960s onwards, the SED adjusted its policy from trying to infiltrate cultural groups and effect a change in leadership to a policy of cooperation. This shift was mirrored by the members of these groups who were actively seeking a dialogue with the party leaders. GDR workers increasingly accepted the cultural institutions and started using these structures to achieve their own goals rather than working against them. In that sense a process of 'normalization' took place during the 1960s and 1970s.

In the following presentation, George Last (London/Berlin) came to a very similar conclusion regarding 'Conflicts in Rural Communities in the GDR: Resolution, Settlement, Control'. He explained how in the decade after the full collectivization of agriculture a *genossenschaftliche Demokratie* with its hierarchy and organs was established, providing a forum in which the rural population could articulate its particular grievances. A new category of functionaries was formed which, with the *Schiedskommissionen* and *Einwohnerforen*, was crucial for the day-to-day resolution, settlement, and control of social conflicts in rural communities. Last argued that it was in part through regularization and the rural population's recognition of this network as a potentially useful means of realizing individual interests at a local level – albeit within the strict ideological parameters of the dictatorship – and sharing not least a common interest in order and security that SED rule became more acceptable.

The first speaker of the second half of the third session, which was chaired by Mark Allison (Bristol), was Arnd Bauerkämper (Berliner Kolleg für Vergleichende Geschichte Europas) who spoke on 'The Experience of Contingency and the Search for Stability: Interpretations of the Weimar Republic and the Nazi Dictatorship and the Struggle for Political Legitimacy in Post-War Germany'. Bauerkämper laid out how the two German states were bound together by the com-

Conference Reports

mon challenge of coming to terms with the immediate past. Both states used strikingly similar techniques and strategies of universalizing and at the same time externalizing the Third Reich from their national narratives, using the years of the Weimar Republic as a 'negative foil' until at least the early 1960s. This interpretation of the past allowed them to present themselves as stable alternatives promising security and a return to 'normalcy' after the traumatic experiences of extreme contingency and ruptures in the previous decades.

Klaus Naumann (Hamburger Institut für Sozialforschung) gave a presentation entitled 'From the War of Extermination to the Peace of the Bomb: Biographies of *Bundeswehr* Generals in the Context of Changing Regimes, Institutions, and Generations', in which he presented three life narratives of *Bundeswehr* generals representing different generations. For members of the generation of 45ers (born in 1924) who actively fought in the war, the ideas of security, tradition, and correcting fate was dominant; the representatives of the generation of *Flak-/Marinehelfer* (born in 1928) were motivated by gratitude and friendship towards the state, and typically defined themselves as soldiers of deterrence wanting to prevent a further war. By comparison, the members of the third generation of the *Trotzdem-Soldaten* (born in 1933) were prouder and more self-confident. While willing to consider that deterrence might not be enough, they, too, had no answer to the dilemma of action. These case studies prove, as Naumann argued, that the story of the West German army cannot simply be seen as a 'success story', but also continues to be overshadowed by the lost war.

In the final talk of this session, 'Kalenderblätter: Perceptions of Everyday Life in the GDR', the third panellist, Jeanette Madarász (Wissenschaftszentrum, Berlin), explored the potential of the diary-like notes of Hubert Biebl, an analytical chemist working at the Chemiefaserwerk Premnitz. These 200 semi-literary texts produced between 1982 and 1984 offer a unique insight into everyday life in the East German dictatorship and should therefore be considered a valuable source for exploring 'how it really was'.

The fourth session, 'Private Lives, Cultural Representations, and Politics', was chaired by Mererid Puw Davies (UCL). The first presentation, 'Rommel um Rommel: Screening the *Wehrmacht* in the 1950s', given by Patrick Major (Warwick), looked at representations of Erwin Rommel as a hero of Anglo-American films such as *The Desert*

Fox (1951), *The Enemy Below* (1957), *The Young Lions* (1958), and *The Longest Day* (1962). Major argued that these films contributed to a rehabilitation of Rommel by de-politicizing the German soldier and subscribing to the myth of a 'clean' desert war. Along with German documentaries such as *Das war unser Rommel*, they adopted an entirely uncritical view of Rommel which was only contested by some Jewish and veterans' organizations and, so Major argued, helped to institute a compartmentalized love-hate attitude towards 'bad Nazis' and love for 'good Germans'.

In her talk on 'The "Betrayed Generation": *Heimkehrer* in West German Public Discourse', the conference co-organizer Christiane Winkler (UCL) analysed a cycle of articles on returnees. The articles appeared in the West German weekly *BILD am Sonntag* in the winter of 1978–9, at a moment when the topic was hardly the subject of public discussion any more. She made the point that the texts and photographs, which mainly depicted returnees from Soviet camps, fostered images that belong to the categories of victims, heroes, and perpetrators, with the category of victims as most dominant. Having been portrayed as victims of both imprisonment and the unwelcoming attitude of the West German state, and having struggled with their reintegration into society, returnees were depicted as a symbol of German victimhood at the specific point in time when, inspired by the TV series *Holocaust*, German guilt increasingly became a subject of public debate.

Bill Niven's (Nottingham Trent) presentation on 'The Influence of Political and Generational Shifts on Representations of the Theme of *Vertreibung*' looked at the debate of German victimhood from a more literary point of view, questioning the claims that *Vertreibung* had been a taboo topic. He argued that along with the bombing of German cities it had been a key theme in West German novels in the two decades following the war. Willy Brandt's *Ostpolitik* changed the character of representation, but the theme of expulsion was still very much present, even for a second generation of West German writers in the 1970s, such as Christine Brückner, who never actually lived there and yet perceived the Eastern territories as their *Heimat*. This idealized perspective was complemented by more critical literary approaches to the topic. Niven concluded that where some aspects might have been taboo in the GDR, this was not the case for West Germany.

The fifth session was chaired by Richard Bessel (York) and was opened by Paul Betts's (Sussex) talk on 'Cold War Civility: West and

Conference Reports

East German Etiquette Books after 1945', in which he asked what the flood of etiquette books in East and West Germany in the years immediately following the war can tell us about post-Nazi reconstruction of civility and attempts at re-education. Between 1945 and 1948 more than 150 etiquette books were published across Germany, addressing a need to recover from catastrophes and to reassert civil society through codes of conduct. They all subscribed to the much older idea that manners hold society together, but nevertheless show evidence of the Cold War situation of divided Germany. In the West, the books emphasized liberal values such as the need for social distance and individuality; in the East they stressed the importance of good manners as the building blocks for a socialist future.

The last talk was held by Dorothee Wierling (Forschungsstelle für Zeitgeschichte, Hamburg) who spoke on 'Sex, Liberation and Unification: Ego-Documents and the GDR'. After discussing the limits and values of ego-documents for the history of the GDR, Wierling presented a case study of a body of letters written in the early 1990s by East Germans to the Flensburg-based company Beate Uhse, the largest West German company selling erotica. In these letters, of which about 500 are preserved, the senders comment on the range of goods as future customers or business partners, but also reflect on their political, social, and sexual situation. Out of the experiences during the GDR when demand was often larger than supply, the senders try to establish a personal relationship with the company and prove their genuine need. The letters also document the enthusiasm present in this period of change, an evolving new understanding of the senders as citizens with certain rights, and a surprising openness. In that sense, the erotica symbolized their hopes and personal liberation.

The final discussion was moderated by Mark Hewitson (UCL). Panellist Thomas Lindenberger (ZZF, Potsdam) picked up the concept of normalization/normalcy by discussing the need for people to return to 'normal' after a period of turmoil. He argued that in the 1970s, normalization in the GDR was limited by a horizontal divide between the 'ordinary' people on one side and the party functionaries on the other. He also pointed out the very specific Western orientation of GDR society, where contacts with the West and West German media were of major importance. Finally, he pleaded for a stronger emphasis on generation when using this particular concept.

The second panellist, Josie McLellan (Bristol), commented on a fixation on periods of change, underlined the importance of examining stasis in history, and questioned the place and meaning it has in life narratives. She also said that it would be worthwhile to look at the connection between motivation and identity, and to consider emotion, which would help historians to capture and better understand the inner life of agents. Furthermore, McLellan pointed out that certain types of sources, such as family photo albums, domestic interiors, and fashion are currently understudied.

The ensuing discussion revolved mostly around the concept of normalization and its value for analysing the 1970s in the GDR. Whereas some speakers explored its potential as a wider historical category, Mary Fulbrook clarified that in her project she used 'normalization' as an 'ideal type' (in the Weberian sense) to explore the relations between broader historical and structural changes on the one hand, and subjective constructions and perceptions of what is 'normal' on the other. She emphasized that notions of 'normal' and 'normality' are constantly contested. However, in this case a consensus on the question could not be achieved.

The conference brought together such a diverse set of presentations that it is impossible to sum up and evaluate the results in only a few words. However, there were a few recurring themes that clearly merit a more in-depth examination, such as the current debate on German victimhood and the historian's perspective on and role in it. The same is true for the generational approach, its validity and limitations, all of which were subjects addressed in several talks. This seems to be to a key theme, not only as a methodology, but also as a factor determining historians' reflections on their own work.

The conference was very generously supported by Marie Curie funding for the UCL Centre for European Studies, the German Historical Institute London, the Gerda Henkel Stiftung, and the German History Society.

JULIA RIDDIFORD (UCL)

Anglo-German Mythologies in Literature, the Visual Arts and Cultural Theory, conference organized by the Centre for Anglo-German Cultural Relations, Queen Mary, University of London, in cooperation with the German Historical Institute London, the Gerda Henkel Stiftung (Düsseldorf), the German Embassy, the Austrian Cultural Forum, and the British Museum, and held at Queen Mary (Mile End Campus), the British Museum, the German Historical Institute (17 Bloomsbury Square), and the German House (34 Belgrave Square) on 25–27 April 2007.

Organized by members of the recently founded Centre for Anglo-German Cultural Relations at Queen Mary (University of London), this international conference addressed the topic of ‘mythologies’ in the history and practice of Anglo-German cultural relations through investigations of literary, visual, cultural, and theoretical texts. The relationship between the English- and German-speaking regions of Europe has, at least since the Reformation, played a determining role in the modern cultural history of the western world. During both the symbiotic phases and the periods of tension in the history of Anglo-German cultural relations, each nation or language group has perceived the other through the deployment of myths and prejudices that have both assisted and hindered them in dealing with the foreign and the unfamiliar. In this sense, *mythos* or myth-making represents the non-rational mode through which human beings first come to terms with ‘foreign’ phenomena by understanding them in narrative and aesthetic terms.

Pursuing these and related issues and questions, the conference organizers brought together a collection of the leading myth scholars and theorists of myth in the German- and English-speaking worlds. Professors Wilfried Barner (Göttingen), Kurt Hübner (Kiel), Christoph Jamme (Lüneberg), and Robert Segal (Aberdeen) were the keynote speakers for this event. Following a reception held in the German Historical Institute (Bloomsbury), the most senior of these figures—Professor Hübner—gave his keynote address, entitled ‘Rationality in Myth and Science’, to an extensive public audience at the British Museum. Professor Barner’s keynote address, entitled ‘Britische und deutsche Mythologeme in der europäischen “Gestalt” Lord Byrons’, was delivered in the German House at Belgrave Square.

Anglo-German Mythologies

This conference was developed from a research colloquium on Anglo-German Mythologies held for graduate students in the German and English departments at Queen Mary between October 2005 and March 2007. The colloquium provided graduate students and recently qualified Ph.D. candidates with the opportunity to prepare workshop papers that were later given on an international stage at the conference. In this way the conference constituted a major contribution not only to the theory of myth and the theory and practice of Anglo-German cultural relations, but also to the research training of British postgraduates in the field. The event was funded by grants from the British Academy, the Gerda Henkel Stiftung, and Queen Mary (University of London), and received extensive logistical support from the German Historical Institute, the British Museum, and the German Embassy (London).

A volume of papers delivered at the conference is to be jointly edited by Professor Görner and Dr Nicholls, and is scheduled for publication in 2009.

ANGUS NICHOLLS (QMUL)

Partisan and Anti-Partisan Warfare in German-Occupied Europe 1939–1945, conference co-organized by the Glasgow Caledonian University, University of Strathclyde, and the German Historical Institute, held at Glasgow, 21–22 June.

The overall aim of the conference, organized jointly by Dr Ben Shepherd (Department of Social Sciences, Glasgow Caledonian University) and Dr Juliette Pattinson (Department of History, University of Strathclyde), was to examine the forces that shaped the conduct of partisan warfare from the perspective of both occupying forces and partisans in German-occupied Europe during the Second World War. The forms of behaviour displayed by both occupation forces and partisans in the course of such warfare ranged from the Germans' brutal mass reprisals and the partisans' use of terror measures to compel popular cooperation, to more conciliatory attempts to win 'hearts and minds'.

The conference provided an opportunity to present and discuss new research in this field. Papers addressed as their theme one or more of the *range* of factors, and not solely the military ones, that shaped conduct in partisan and/or anti-partisan warfare in German-occupied Europe. Such factors could be ideological, environmental, economic, cultural, psychological, or political in nature.

The keynote paper, which was the first to be delivered on the morning of the conference's first day, was given by Professor Evan Mawdsley of the University of Glasgow. It was entitled 'Anti-German Rebellions and their Place in Allied Grand Strategy', and was intended to provide a Europe-wide overview in order to contextualize the rest of the papers. All the other papers presented a national, regional, or local-level case study of partisan and/or anti-partisan warfare. They were divided into seven panels across the two days:

- The Soviet Union I
- The Soviet Union II
- Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union: The German Police and Anti-Partisan Warfare
- Yugoslavia
- Italy
- Greece
- France

Some papers, such as Alex Statiev's on partisan warfare in the Soviet Union's western borderlands, and Julie le Gac's on relations between the Western Allies and Italian partisans, took a broad, regional-level or national-level view which incorporated elements of higher level strategy into their analysis. Others, such as Erich Haberer's paper on the German Gendarmerie and Soviet partisans in the Baranovichi region, and Florian Dierl's paper on anti-partisan warfare in Crete, took more of a micro-level approach focusing upon particular localities.

Following the final panel on the afternoon of Friday 22 June, delegates were invited to participate in a general discussion of the main points that had emerged over the previous two days. This served the purpose not only of drawing the conference to a proper close, but also of providing the conference organizers with further ideas as to themes that could be emphasized in publications based on the conference papers. It was felt that, collectively, the papers had highlighted the particular importance of the following factors in shaping the conduct of partisan and anti-partisan warfare:

- Ideology, which conditioned the conduct both of German anti-partisan forces, and of various partisan groups towards each other;
- Particular local-level conditions, which often were at variance with the wider regional and national picture, and which could result in significant variations in the degrees of both ruthlessness and restraint which both partisan and anti-partisan forces exercised;
- The particular dynamics of relations between partisan groups and local populations, shaped among other things by whether the partisan groups themselves had local origins;
- On the German side, higher-level command failures, be it in terms of misreading the military situation regarding the partisans, or failing to enact a more attractive occupation policy that would have won the occupied population over more effectively;
- Changing approaches to partisan and anti-partisan warfare over time, during not just the Second World War itself, but also into the post-war period, with partisan groups turning on each other in civil war-like conditions after the German occupation had ended.

Conference Reports

The importance of these primary factors, together with others, will be emphasized in the introductory sections of the publications arising from the conference. Papers delivered at the conference with a higher level, more strategic focus—those by Evan Mawdsley, Alex Statiev, Ed Westermann, Julie le Gac, and Peter Lieb—will be published in a special edition of *Journal of Strategic Studies*. The second publication resulting from this conference, for which a proposal was submitted in November 2007 to Routledge, will be an edited collection based on the remaining conference papers dealing with partisan and anti-partisan warfare in eastern and southern Europe. The provisional title is *War in a Twilight World: Partisan and Anti-partisan Warfare in Eastern and Southern Europe, 1939–1945*.

BEN SHEPHERD (Glasgow)

National Traditions or International Trends? Reconsidering the Fifties and Sixties as an Orientation Period in West Germany, conference organized by Friedrich Kießling (Friedrich-Alexander University, Erlangen-Nuremberg) and Bernhard Rieger (University College London) in cooperation with the German Historical Institute London, held at University College London, 14–15 September 2007.

This conference explicitly aimed to create space for productive discussion and exploration of the perspectives on the 1950s and 1960s raised in a position paper circulated before the conference. This report, therefore, will not attempt to reproduce the conference proceedings in detail, but will outline the conceptual thrust that emerged after the conference.

In describing the processes that transformed the Federal Republic of Germany in the 1950s and 1960s, historians have recently resorted to using two closely connected fundamental concepts. The changes were seen, first, as a process of opening towards and converging with international, mainly Western, ideas about the world and life; and secondly as a process of substitution, in which long-standing elements of political and social culture were relinquished, step by step, and replaced by democratic and pluralist attitudes and ideas. Depending on what emphasis was chosen, the process was described as 'Westernization' or 'liberalization/modernization'. The conference held at UCL took a critical look at these interpretations, which have become increasingly established since the end of the 1980s, with the aim of expanding them through the categories of tradition, reorientation, and transformation. Four areas emerged in our discussions.

(1) While the processes of transformation have frequently been described, the attitude of contemporaries to the actual changes that took place has much less often been discussed. Yet change and transformation were frequently the subject of contemporary processes of self-scrutiny. Attitudes to 'modernization' or 'internationalization' defined allegiances in West German society. Thus, how actors and commentators positioned themselves towards processes of transformation—encouraging change, preventing it, or simply evaluating it—became crucially important. Debates were structured in terms of the positions attributed to participants, and legitimacy was achieved,

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL)

Conference Reports

or at least sought, via attitudes to social change. Self-reflection on the topic of change remains an important factor to be explored in the debates and discourses of the period.

(2) Although most studies of West German society in the 1950s and 1960s assume complicated transformation processes, many descriptions at least implicitly rely on a contrast between 'old' and 'new' attitudes, and 'international' and 'national' movements. The contributions to the conference supplemented and differentiated these simple dichotomies. The frequent identification of 'international' with 'modern' and 'old' with 'national' proved to be problematic, and the teleological model implicit in such contrasts was questioned. New patterns of orientation, it was suggested, were successful precisely because they could easily be combined with conventional models, or because they could connect with ideas – dating from the Kaiserreich or the inter-war period, perhaps – that were already familiar. The significance and function of tradition and continuity in times of change therefore require further examination, especially as particular well-known elements of political and social culture were still clearly visible after 1970, and in some cases are apparent to the present day. In this context, the role of deliberate 'inventions of tradition' grounded in points of reference declared to be 'German', 'international', or 'Western', presented a concern. Although these categories could stand in tension to each other, they were in principle by no means mutually exclusive. Thus scholars must pay particular attention to the discursive dimension to distinguish different levels of awareness in creations of tradition as well as their points of reference.

(3) Relating processes of change in the various areas of historical reality to each other poses a special challenge. While change in everyday culture or lifestyle debates may have progressed a long way quite early, transformations in other areas such as the history of political ideas apparently took much longer. It was a particular aim of the conference to scrutinize this and to bring out differences and specific features clearly. Only on this basis can a comparison be undertaken between the individual areas without prematurely suggesting that West German post-war history was uniformly a 'success or arrival story', or a 'postlude' to earlier periods.

(4) The conference deliberately considered the whole of the West German 1950s and 1960s. The intention was systematically to go beyond the frequently investigated 'long' 1960s (from the late 1950s

National Traditions or International Trends?

to the early 1970s) at least in one direction when describing processes of change. While the 1950s are generally seen as a time of change against a conservative background, the 'long' 1960s are often held up as their opposite and placed under the sign of progressive change. By going beyond the break at the end of the 1950s identified in many studies, the intention of the conference organizers was to push debate about the historicization of the old Federal Republic of Germany beyond the division into decades. A number of contributions to the conference therefore also looked forward to the 1970s.

Taking these issues and questions which arose out of the lively discussion in London as points of orientation, the contributions to the conference can be divided into three groups. One set of papers investigated concepts of order in the fundamental discourses of the 1950s and 1960s, while two other groups of contributions, taking specific examples from the history of West Germany during those decades, focused on the place of internationalism and tradition respectively in the West German debates of those years. Ralph Jessen (Cologne), speaking on 'Learning from History, Missing the Future? The Post-War Success Story and the Crisis of the Seventies in West Germany' opened the conference by introducing general, overarching questions on current debates. He encouraged a re-conceptualization of the history of the Federal Republic of Germany.

In the context of fundamental concepts of order in the 1950s and 1960s, Bernhard Löffler (Passau), who was unfortunately unable to attend because of illness, was to have spoken on 'Ludwig Erhard's Concepts and Methods for Economic Policy Between National Traditions and American Models'. His paper introduced the problem of national and international connections in Ludwig Erhard's economic policy, which frequently related to the international debates of the inter-war period. Speaking on 'The Politics of Landscape and Technology in Germany after 1945', Thomas Zeller (Maryland) asked what notions of order were effective in the debates on traffic safety, given the huge rise in the number of casualties. In a paper entitled 'Democracy on Trial: What German Citizens Wrote about Democracy and Justice in the Context of the Serial Killer Jürgen Bartsch, 1966-71', Kerstin Brückweh (London) related the different reactions to Bartsch's two trials as the 1960s gave way to the 1970s to contemporaneous changes in social understandings of West German democracy. Under the title 'No Satire, Please: "German Humour" after 1945',

Conference Reports

Martina Kessel (Bielefeld) investigated a post-1945 tradition of humour that deliberately presented itself as 'German'. As had already happened during the Weimar Republic and the Third Reich, humorists who felt committed to this school—in explicit contrast to satirists—fell back on social dichotomies and circled around the relationship between supposedly impotent individuals and all-powerful authority. Despite the thematic variety, all speakers pursued the question of whether, after 1945, turning points can be identified which suggest fundamental changes in the West German understanding of the relationship between individual, society, and hierarchical authority.

Under the heading of 'Das Eigene und das Fremde in Zeiten des Wandels', five participants looked at attitudes to internationalism and national traditions in a changing world. In his paper on 'National Traditions and Transnational Permeation in the Rise of the West German Mass Consumption Society', Detlef Siegfried (Copenhagen) examined national movements or ascriptions in West Germany's emergent consumer society, an area, as the speaker emphasized, that was fundamentally shaped by extremely strong international connections. Friedrich Kießling (Erlangen), speaking on 'Goethe and the American MP: Conditions of Internationalism in (West) German Intellectual History after 1945', dealt with the issue of national and international connections in West German intellectual history after 1945. In particular, he asked about fundamental attitudes to internationalism within this discipline, and related it to connections inherent in various intellectual concepts. In his paper on 'The Expellees and the Question of *Ostpolitik* in the 1950s and 1960s', Pertti Ahonen (Edinburgh) showed how the initially stereotyped notions of *Heimat* among the expellees' associations gradually and with a great deal of conflict gave way to a discourse about Europe that gave expellees a chance for reconciliation at a personal level with the consequences of the Second World War. Dietmar Rothermund (Heidelberg), speaking on 'The Origins of Development Policies in West Germany', pointed in a different direction from West Germany's frequently investigated look to the 'West', asking, among other things, whether this is why identifiably national orientations continued to exist here. In his paper entitled 'Paradise Lost? Colonialism, Social Criticism, and Scientific Conservation in Bernhard Grzimek's Wildlife Documentaries during the 1950s', Johannes Paulmann (Mannheim) investigated the interna-

National Traditions or International Trends?

tional dimension of this popular genre which has so far been seen by scholars primarily as contributing to the Germans' search for a (moral) identity after 1945. One of the main intentions here was to make clear that there were many international frames of reference which helped drive forward and understand social, political, and intellectual change.

The third set of papers concentrated on the place of continuity and tradition at times of change. In a contribution to the history of political ideas, Jens Hacke's (Berlin) paper 'National Tradition and Democratic Re-Education: Theodor Eschenburg, Dolf Sternberger, and West German Liberalism' looked at the ideas of Theodor Eschenburg and Dolf Sternberger, whose persuasiveness derived from a mixture of new orientations and continuities in the history of ideas. Elizabeth Heineman (Iowa) speaking on 'Sexuality in Reconstruction West Germany: Post-Fascist, Post-War, or just Post-Victorian?' looked at the complex and changeable network of references to the past that emerges in West German discourses on sexuality. She investigated the strained relations that existed between a public rhetoric that emphasized the uniqueness of West German developments, and the actual course of West German sexual history, which broadly followed Western European patterns. Bernhard Rieger (London), in his paper on 'The Court Case Against Volkswagen, 1949-1961', showed that going beyond questions of reappraisal, guilt, and responsibility, the Nazi period could be seen as a normal part of the past from which legal and financial claims could, as a matter of course, be derived. The high-profile West German discussions about military and civil use of nuclear power, which Holger Nehring (Sheffield) looked at in his paper entitled 'Progress and Fear: Debates About "the Atom" in the 1950s and early 1960s', in their turn revealed traces of the immediate past. He discussed the extent to which the experience of disasters in particular shaped attitudes to nuclear power in Germany compared with Britain. As a whole, the contributions to the third session show that the Federal Republic of Germany's relationship to the past was not limited to a partial coming to terms with Nazism, which is at the centre of historical research. Rather, we must direct attention to the often problematic historical reference frames that made arrival in the postwar present easier for citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany. The conference proceedings will be published.

Conference Reports

FRIEDRICH KIESSLING (Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-
Nuremberg)

BERNHARD RIEGER (University College London)

Sixth Workshop on Early Modern Central European History, co-organized by the German Historical Institute London, the German History Society, and the University of Hull, and held at the German Historical Institute London, 19 October 2007.

After last year's successful visit to Munich the workshop returned to its usual location at the German Historical Institute London for the 2007 meeting organized by Peter Wilson (Hull) and Michael Schaich (GHIL). More than twenty early modernists from Britain, Ireland, and Germany assembled to discuss papers ranging from the realm of monarchs and aristocrats to the more sober worlds of officers and merchants, and in-between the ramifications of early modern religious culture. Chronologically the papers spread fairly evenly from the Reformation to the late eighteenth century, which was particularly appropriate since the sixteenth century had been conspicuous by its absence during some of the earlier workshops.

Participants were welcomed by Andreas Gestrich, director of the GHIL, and Peter Wilson (Hull), who gave a brief introduction to the workshop and also had the sad duty of paying tribute to Trevor Johnson, one of the founding members of the workshop who had died prematurely only a few months earlier.¹ Proceedings began with a session on 'Courts and Nobilities' chaired by Michael Schaich (GHIL). Sara Smart (Exeter) introduced the audience to her research project on Johann von Besser's *Krönungs-Geschichte* (1702), the official account of the first and only Prussian coronation in 1701. She illustrated the various ways in which Besser, Frederick I's court poet, represented the newly anointed king's regal status by emphasizing his inherent royalty, the magnificence of his court, the sheer size of his army, and his full integration into European diplomatic relations. Moving from the apex of early modern society down to its second rank, Klaus Margreiter (Speyer) then dealt with the process of transformation which the central and western European nobilities underwent in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In particular, he stressed the paradox that by the seventeenth century, newly created nobles could neither hope for sufficient economic rewards for their upward social mobility nor for social integration into the higher ech-

¹ An obituary of Trevor Johnson by Peter Wilson can be found in *German History*, 26 (2008), 112-14.

Conference Reports

elons of aristocratic society. Yet the number of those aspiring to ennoblement never slackened. According to Margreiter, this constant demand can only be explained by distinguishing between different concepts of nobility within the system of early modern absolutism. Whereas the social category of nobility receded into the background, the ideological and symbolic aspects of noble status took centre-stage and account for its enduring appeal.

The focus of the second session, chaired by David Lederer (Maynooth), shifted to the theme of 'Religion and Identity' and, for its first part, to the Reformation period. Paul Brand (York) presented his research on the spiritualist movement in the early sixteenth century, elucidating mainly the different ways of acquiring religious knowledge. In particular, he drew attention to the role of the inner convictions of the believer as the authority by which to judge and test religious messages. Since this critical stance also applied to the printed word and to general developments such as the neo-clericalism of the age, spiritualist epistemology can be labelled the earliest critique of the confessionalization thesis. The diversity and openness of religious identities in the Reformation period was also at the centre of Katherine Hill's (Oxford) paper on Anabaptist hymnology. By reconstructing the publishing history of central Anabaptist hymns in the 1520s and 1530s she could show how different texts and melodies were used across confessional and inner-confessional divides disclosing a surprisingly large stock of common ideas which floated freely between different religious groups and at the same time demarcated a shared intellectual universe.

Problems of identity resurfaced in the next two papers, which moved the discussion into the eighteenth century. Katherine Hester (Oxford) looked at Moravian girls' schools, especially in the 1740s and 1750s when they spread in Europe and to North America. She laid particular emphasis on the crucial role of the choir system for the institutional life of Moravian girls and the importance of literacy within the curriculum. Although the teaching of literacy was primarily a response to the need of Moravian women to participate in the communal life and to read devotional works, it also fostered their intellectual development. On a slightly different note Andreas Bähr (Free University of Berlin) took his audience on a tour through the dream worlds of the early modern period in his paper on 'Spaces of Dreaming: Self-Constitution in Early Modern Dream Narratives'.

Drawing mainly on autobiographies and other ego-documents he elaborated on the terrifying dream imagination as the most important and prominent aspect of the overall topic. Fear and anxiety acquired a particular urgency in the early modern period since, according to a wide-spread Aristotelian concept, nightmares were capable of becoming self-fulfilling prophecies. Until the eighteenth century contemporaries believed that it was possible to dream one's own future and, by dreaming it, to accomplish it. For example, the fear of plague could lead to the outbreak of plague. In this perspective 'fear' could also have severe consequences for the individual: the disintegration of the person and even insanity. Modern historians, therefore, fail to understand processes of early modern self-identification if they analyse the self within a modern frame of reference, as often happens in academic literature.

After the lunch break the first afternoon session, chaired by Thomas Biskup (Hull), was dedicated to two aspects of the history of early modern 'Military and War': the experience of colonial officers in India and the reporting about military conflict in late seventeenth-century Europe. On a different level, however, both papers also dealt with the wider issue of the encounter between East and West in the pre-modern era. In his paper Chen Tzoref-Ashkenazi (Heidelberg) widened the debate about the discourse of colonialism in Germany both by going back into the late eighteenth century and by concentrating on the responses of non-intellectuals such as military officers to their experiences of the East, in this case colonial India. Based on letters published in German journals and magazines at the time and a number of autobiographical reports by Hanoverian soldiers in the service of the East India Company, he analysed the varying degrees of identification with the British colonial project and stressed the role of the press in the formation of colonial identities back in Germany. Another version of the wider story was told by Gary Evans (University of the West of England). By analysing the reception of the conflict between the Habsburgs and the Ottoman Empire in late seventeenth-century Britain, he demonstrated how fluid attitudes towards the East were. They were shaped by the pre-established knowledge about the Ottomans and their enemies that functioned as a filter, the significance of the Christian religion for internal British debates, and the way reports from the conflict area were bound up with Britain's interior political situation in the 1680s and 1690s. In

Conference Reports

this context, for example, the role and representation of the Hungarian rebels changed dramatically within a short period of time.

The transnational leitmotif of these papers to some extent continued in the next session on 'Commerce and Law' which was chaired by Beat Kümin (Warwick). Heinrich Lang (Bamberg) explored the relationship between the Augsburg Welser company and the Florentine Salviati bankers' family. Both families were engaged in long-distance trade and the credit business and worked together very closely. For example, they arranged loans for the French monarchy and held stakes in merchant ships in the Levant. Since their dealings can be gleaned in great detail from account books in the Salviati archives, they form a prime example of a transnational commercial network. In contrast to the wide-ranging activities of these two firms the focus of Masatake Wasa's (Oxford) paper was on beer brewing and retailing in the small city of Anklam in Swedish Pomerania in the second half of the seventeenth century. In an intriguing discussion of the regulatory mechanisms which ruled the beer trade in this town, he underlined the importance of the notion of the common good for the process. Petitions for exemptions from existing regulations had to satisfy three tests: necessity, proportionality, and the common weal (as opposed to private interest). If successful they also had the capacity to change statutory law over time and thus instigate a flexible system of regulation which only came to an end with the advent of the eighteenth century, when the desire for uniformity crippled the mechanism.

The day concluded with a general discussion chaired by Peter Wilson about the overarching themes and concepts that had come up in the different papers. As in previous workshops, several papers had engaged critically with the confessionalization paradigm and with ideas of early modern state-formation. Other papers and discussions also questioned the validity of network theory or the unity of the early modern period as a whole. Most striking, however, was the mark left by new trends of global or transnational history in some of the papers. Clearly, early modern historians still have to appreciate the full extent of this reorientation of the historical disciplines which is also apparent, among others, in the renewed interest in missionary and religious societies, transnational spaces of communication, or the history of objects, and the benefits that can be reaped for

Sixth Workshop on Early Modern Central European History

their own area of expertise. On the other hand, there was concern about how the wider issue of global history will impact on the study of early modern central European history and whether it will divert interest from the study of allegedly traditional subjects, not least with regard to research funding and the allocation of academic posts. There remains, then, a whole array of issues that can be fruitfully discussed at the Seventh Workshop on Early Modern Central European History, which is scheduled for 24 October 2008.

MICHAEL SCHAICH (GHIL)

NOTICEBOARD

Research Seminar

The GHIL regularly organizes a research seminar at which recipients of grants from the Institute, Fellows of the GHIL, and other scholars report on the progress of their work. Any postgraduate or postdoctoral researchers who are interested in the subjects are welcome to attend. As a general rule, the language of the papers and discussion is German, and meetings start at 5 p.m. unless otherwise indicated.

The following papers will be given this term. Further meetings may also be arranged. Future dates will be announced on each occasion, and are available from the GHIL. For further information contact Dr Martina Steber on 020 7309 2015 or by email at: msteber@ghil.ac.uk

- 6 May Christian Götter
Begegnung zweier Welten? Militär und Medien in der Zeit der Weltkriege
- 27 May Tobias Becker
Inszenierte Moderne: Unterhaltungstheater in Berlin und London, 1880–1930
- 3 June Dr Andreas Hilger
(3 p.m.) Die Beziehung der UdSSR zu Indien und Pakistan, 1941–64: Sowjetische internationale Beziehungen im Spannungsfeld von Kaltem Krieg und Globalisierung
- Robert Heinze
Promoting National Unity: Nationalismus im Radio der Frontline States Namibia und Zambia
- 24 June Evelyn Gottschlich
Das Königreich im Schneeland: Die europäische Entdeckung und Aneignung Tibets 1626–1860

Noticeboard

- 1 July Miriam Weiß
Die Arbeitsweise des Matthäus Paris an den *Chronica maiora*
- 15 July Martina Krocova
Die Wahrnehmung von den räumlichen Grenzen: Sächsisch-böhmische und irisch-britische Grenzen im Vergleich (1750–1850)
- 22 July Dr Christian Geulen
Title to be confirmed
- 29 July Dr Dietmar Süß
Tod aus der Luft: Deutschland, Großbritannien und der Luftkrieg (1918–2000)
- 26 Aug. (3 p.m.) Dr Ralf Lützel Schwab
Herrschen durch Heilige? Die Reliquienschatze europäischer Herrscher und Herrscherkirchen und ihr Einfluss auf die herrscherliche Legitimierung (13.–16. Jahrhundert)
- Dr Torsten Riotte
Legitimität und Öffentlichkeit: Exilmonarchie von Karl Stuart bis Wilhelm II.

As a matter of interest to readers, we record the following papers which were given before the publication date of this *Bulletin*:

- 20 Nov. Daniel Schumacher
(2007) Remembrance Sunday und Symbol des Poppy in London
- 19 Feb. Michael Penk
Konflikt und Kooperation: Island in der Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik der atlantischen Großmächte Deutschland, Großbritannien und der USA, 1930–51
- 4 Mar. Christiane Reinecke
Politik der Migrationskontrolle in Großbritannien und Deutschland, 1880–1930

Noticeboard

- 18 Mar. Dr Sandra Maß
Umkämpfte Spielregeln: Der 'richtige' Umgang mit Geld im 19. Jahrhundert in transnationaler und kulturhistorischer Perspektive
- 1 Apr. Dr Kristina Küntzel-Witt
Sibirien in der Historiographie des 18. Jahrhunderts
- 15 Apr. Angelika Schoder
Die Vermittlung des Unbegreiflichen: Deutsche und britische Erinnerungskultur und Geschichtspolitik im Vergleich
- 29 Apr. Anne Blaudzun
Germanophilie eines britischen Gelehrten: Geschichtspolitik und Historiographie bei George Peabody Gooch (1873–1968)

Scholarships Awarded by the GHIL

Each year the GHIL awards a number of research scholarships to German postgraduate and postdoctoral students to enable them to carry out research in Britain, and to British postgraduates for research visits to Germany. The scholarships are generally awarded for a period of up to six months, depending on the requirements of the research project. British applicants will normally be expected to have completed one year's postgraduate research, and be studying German history or Anglo-German relations. Scholarships are advertised each year in September on H-Soz-u-Kult and the GHIL's website. Applications may be sent in at any time, but allocations are made for the following calendar year. Applications, which should include a CV, educational background, list of publications (where appropriate), and an outline of the project, together with a supervisor's reference confirming the relevance of the proposed archival research, should be addressed to the Director, German Historical Institute London, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2 NJ.

During their stay in Britain, German scholars present their projects and the initial results of their research at the Institute's Research

Seminar, and British scholars do the same on their return from Germany. In the first allocation for 2008 the following scholarships have been awarded for research on British history, German history, and Anglo-German relations.

Ph.D. Scholarships

Tobias Becker: Inszenierte Moderne: Unterhaltungstheater in Berlin und London, 1880–1930

Anne Blaudzun: Germanophilie eines britischen Gelehrten: Geschichtspolitik und Historiographie bei George Peabody Gooch (1873–1968)

Alexandria Kerr Flucker: Wehrmacht Health and Medical Services during the Italian campaign, 1943–4: An Army Level Study

Christian Götter: Begegnung zweier Welten? Militär und Medien in der Zeit der Weltkriege

Evelyn Gottschlich: Das Königreich im Schneeland: Die europäische Entdeckung und Aneignung Tibets 1626–1860

Robert Heinze: Promoting National Unity: Nationalismus im Radio der Frontline States Namibia und Zambia

Dr Andreas Hilger: Die Beziehung der UdSSR zu Indien und Pakistan, 1941–64: Sowjetische internationale Beziehungen im Spannungsfeld von Kaltem Krieg und Globalisierung

Martina Krocova: Die Wahrnehmung von den räumlichen Grenzen: Sächsisch-böhmische und irisch-britische Grenzen im Vergleich (1750–1850)

Sara Kröper: Neue Universitäten – neue Urbanität? Fallstudie zur Verbindung von universitären Neugründungen und Stadtentwicklungen

Dr Falco Neiningner: Die Pfarreien in England im 13. Jahrhundert: Strukturen, Ressourcen und Klerus im Spannungsfeld konkurrierender Interessen

Michael Penk: Konflikt und Kooperation: Island in der Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik der atlantischen Großmächte Deutschland, Großbritannien und der USA, 1930–51

Christiane Reinecke: Politik der Migrationskontrolle in Großbritannien und Deutschland, 1880–1930

Angelika Schoder: Die Vermittlung des Unbegreiflichen: Deutsche und britische Erinnerungskultur und Geschichtspolitik im Vergleich

Noticeboard

Miriam Weiß: Die Arbeitsweise des Matthäus Paris an den *Chronica maiora*

Dr Oliver Werner: Der Mitteldeutsche Handelsverein aus britischer Perspektive (1828 bis 1834)

DGIA travel grants

Dr Volker Barth: Weltnachrichtenordnung: Strukturen und Bedingungen internationaler Kommunikation, 1859–1934

Dr Rüdiger Graf: Energiesicherheit, Regierbarkeit und Globalitätsbewusstsein: Reaktionen der westlichen Industrienationen auf die arabische Ölpolitik in den 1970er Jahren

Dr Kristina Küntzel-Witt: Sibirien in der Historiographie des 18. Jahrhunderts

Dr Ralph Lützel Schwab: Herrschen durch Heilige? Die Reliquienschatze europäischer Herrscher und Herrscherkirchen und ihr Einfluss auf die herrscherliche Legitimierung (13.–16. Jahrhundert)

Dr Sandra Maß: Umkämpfte Spielregeln: Der 'richtige' Umgang mit Geld im 19. Jahrhundert in transnationaler und kulturhistorischer Perspektive

Dr Torsten Riote: Legitimität und Öffentlichkeit: Exilmonarchie von Karl Stuart bis Wilhelm II.

Postgraduate Students' Conference

The German Historical Institute London held its twelfth postgraduate students' conference on 10–12 Jan. 2008. Its intention was to give postgraduate research students in the UK and Ireland working on German history an opportunity to present their work-in-progress, and to discuss it with other students working in the same or a similar field. The conference opened with warm words of welcome by the deputy director of the GHIL, Benedikt Stuchtey. Over the next two days, twenty-two speakers from Germany, Ireland, and the United Kingdom introduced their projects to an interested and engaged

audience. Most sessions were devoted to the nineteenth century, the First World War, the inter-war period, the Third Reich, and the post-1945 period. Only one paper was given on the early modern period and none on the Middle Ages. Participants gave a short summary of their work containing general ideas, leading questions, sources, and initial findings, and this was followed by discussion. Most papers focused on the long twentieth century, and it is striking that yet again scholarly interest seems to have been moving away from the Third Reich to either the First World War (with some emphasis on the colonies) and the inter-war years, or post-war Germany. Also conspicuous was the prominence of approaches from cultural history in many of the presentations.

As well as discussing their subjects and methodologies, the participants exchanged information about practical difficulties. Many comments came from the floor, often addressing alternative perspectives and additional sources. Information about institutions that give grants for research in Germany was also exchanged. The German Historical Institute can offer support here by facilitating contact with German archives and providing letters of introduction which may be necessary for students to gain access to archives or specific source collections. In certain cases it may help students to make contact with particular German universities and professors. The German Historical Institute also provides scholarships for research in Germany (see above).

The GHIL is planning to hold the next postgraduate students' conference early in 2009. For further information, including how to apply, please contact the Secretary, Anita Bellamy, German Historical Institute, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NJ, or by email at: abellamy@ghil.ac.uk

Speakers at the 2008 Postgraduate Students' Conference

Christian Bailey (Yale): Refractions: German Political Ideology after 1945 Through the Prism of Europe

Silke Betscher (Liverpool): How the Cold War Came into the Minds of the Germans: Press Pictures as a Media for Creating the 'Self' and the 'Other' in Germany, 1945-50

Marvin Fried (LSE): War Aims and Peace Conditions: Austria-Hungary's Foreign Policy in the Western Balkans, 1914-18

Noticeboard

- Aoife Gleeson* (NUI Maynooth): Suicide in the Judicial Process of Early Modern Germany
- Christian Glossner* (Oxford): Economy and Democracy: The Political Communication and Public Reception of the Social Market Economy in Post-War West Germany, 1945–9
- Sarah Hackett* (Durham): Integrated or Isolated? The Experiences of Muslim Immigrants in Bremen c.1960 to the Present
- Mark Jones* (EUI Florence): German and Italian Agents of Violence in the Post-War Period, 1918–23
- Pete Kakel* (RHUL): Projects of ‘Space’ and ‘Race’: Settler Imperialism, Settler Colonialism, and Frontier Genocide in the ‘American West’ and the ‘Nazi East’
- Chris Knowles* (UL): Winning the Peace: The British in Occupied Germany, 1945–51
- Jan Lemnitzer* (LSE): Maritime Law of Warfare in the Franco-German War of 1870–1: On the Road to Total War?
- Alois Maderspacher* (Cambridge): Colonial Violence in German Cameroon and its Origins and Repercussions in the German Reich, 1892–3
- Roshan Magub* (Birkbeck): Edgar Julius Jung (1894–1934): A Political Biography
- Stefan Moitra* (UCL): Working-Class Culture and Cinema in Britain and Germany after 1945: A Comparative Study of South Wales and the Ruhr
- Aodhan O’Shea* (UCL, Bielefeld): The *Deutscher Werkbund*: Historicism, Classicism and Aesthetic Experience in Early Twentieth-Century Modernity
- Andy Pearce* (RHUL): Holocaust Education: Reflections on Issues and Controversies
- Emma Peplow* (LSE): The Western Allies in Berlin, 1945–8
- Julia Riddiford* (UCL): Nazi Hunters – Idealists – Troublemakers: Simon Wiesenthal, Robert Kempner, Beate Klarsfeld, Hermann Langbein, Fritz Bauer, Friedrich Karl Kaul. A Case Study of Politics and Public Opinion in FRG, GDR and Austria
- Ingrid Rock* (UCL): Female Auxiliaries in the German Armed Forces from 1939–45: Anomalous, or Unavoidable in the Age of Total War?
- Sven de Roode* (Manchester): Preliminary Findings in the Perception of the European Community and the European Union in Germany, the Netherlands and Great Britain in Comparative Perspective, 1951–93

Noticeboard

Daniel Steinbach (TCD): *The Clash of Empires: The First World War in the German and British Colonies of East Africa*

Hester Vaizey (Cambridge): *The German Family, 1939-55*

Tom Williams (Oxford): *Historical Memory and Regional Identity in the Franco-German Borderlands, 1918-57*

Prize of the German Historical Institute London

The German Historical Institute London awards an annual prize for an outstanding Ph.D. thesis on German history (submitted to a British university), British history (submitted to a German university), Anglo-German relations, or an Anglo-German comparative topic. The Prize is 1,000 Euros. In 2007 the prize was awarded to Astrid Swenson for her thesis, 'Conceptualising Heritage in Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth Century France, Germany and England', submitted to the University of Cambridge.

To be eligible for the 2008 prize a thesis must have been submitted to a British or German university after 31 Aug. 2007. To apply, send:

- ~ one copy of the thesis
- ~ a one-page abstract
- ~ examiners' reports on the thesis
- ~ a brief CV
- ~ a declaration that the author will allow it to be considered for publication in the Institute's German-language series, and that the work will not be published before the judges have reached a final decision

to reach the Director of the German Historical Institute London, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NJ, by 31 Aug. 2008.

The Prize will be presented on the occasion of the Institute's Annual Lecture in November 2008.

For further information visit: www.ghil.ac.uk
Email: ghil@ghil.ac.uk Tel: 020 7309 2050

Noticeboard

Staff News

KERSTIN BRÜCKWEH studied history at the University of Bielefeld and Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA. Before joining the GHIL as a Research Fellow in 2007 she worked as a politics and history editor in Munich. Her main field of interest is the twentieth century. She received an MA for a study of the history of medicine and medical ethics in the USA and wrote a Ph.D. thesis on the history of violence in Germany, published in 2006 as *Mordlust: Serienmorde, Gewalt und Emotionen im 20. Jahrhundert*. She is now working on a history of market research and opinion polling in Great Britain and is also a member of the editorial committee of the *GHIL Bulletin*.

CHRIS MANIAS joined the GHIL in October 2007 as a Research Assistant on the series *British Envoys to Germany* after studying at King's College London and Birkbeck College, University of London. His primary research interests are in the fields of modern European history (particularly nineteenth-century Britain, France, and Germany), transnational history, the history of the human sciences, and the history of historiography. He is currently working on a monograph based on his Ph.D. thesis, which was entitled 'Learned Societies and the Ancient National Past in Britain, France and Germany, 1830 to 1890' and examined changing scholarly conceptions of the earliest periods of national history and their implications for nineteenth-century ideas of nationality, race, and social development.

MARKUS MÖSSLANG, who joined the GHIL in 1999, studied modern and social history at the University of Munich where he was a research assistant in 1997/8. His Ph.D. thesis was published in 2002 as *Flüchtlingslehrer und Flüchtlingshochschullehrer*. He is co-editor of *British Envoys to Germany, 1816–1866*, ii. 1830–1847 (2002) and iii. 1848–1850 (2006), and is currently editing iv. 1851–1865. He is the co-editor (with Torsten Riotte) of *The Diplomats' World: The Cultural History of Diplomacy, 1815–1914* (forthcoming 2008). His main fields of interest are nineteenth-century Anglo-German relations and the cultural history of diplomacy.

Noticeboard

TOM NEUHAUS joined the GHIL in October 2007 as a Research Assistant working on a number of different projects. He completed a BA in modern history at the University of Essex, followed by an M.Phil. and a Ph.D. at the University of Cambridge. His research focuses on German and British representations of Tibet and the Himalayas in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. More generally he is interested in issues of German colonialism and engagement overseas, environmental history, and the history of emotions. He is currently re-working his doctoral thesis into a monograph as well as co-editing a collection of essays on German imperialism.

MICHAEL SCHAICH joined the GHIL in 1999. After completing an MA he became a Research Assistant in the Department of History at the University of Munich. He is the editor (with Jörg Neuheiser) of *Political Rituals in Great Britain, 1700–2000* (2006) and of *Monarchy and Religion: The Transformation of Royal Culture in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (2007). While at the Institute he is working on the British monarchy in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. He is also a librarian at the Institute, and a member of the editorial committee of the *GHIL Bulletin*.

JOCHEN SCHENK, who joined the GHIL in October 2007, studied history and Islamic studies at the University of Tübingen and Trinity College Dublin. He received an M.Phil. in medieval studies from Trinity College Dublin in 2001 and in 2006 successfully completed his Ph.D. at Cambridge University with a thesis on 'Family Involvement in the Order of the Temple in Burgundy, Champagne and Languedoc, c.1120–c.1307', which is currently being prepared for publication. In 2006 he was elected an Andrew Mellon Research Scholar at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies in Toronto and it was during the tenure of the fellowship that he began working on a religious history of the medieval military orders, a project which he is now pursuing with particular focus on their spirituality and popular perception as religious institutions in medieval England. His publications include 'Forms of Lay Association with the Order of the Temple', *Journal of Medieval History*, 34/1 (2008), 70–103 and 'Aspects of Non-Noble Family Involvement in the Order of the Temple', in Judi Upton-Ward (ed.), *The Military Orders*, iv (2008), 155–61. He is also a member of the editorial committee of the *GHIL Bulletin*.

Noticeboard

INDRA SENGUPTA joined the GHIL in September 2004. She studied history at the University of Calcutta and received her doctoral degree from the University of Heidelberg. She has taught at the Universities of Calcutta and Heidelberg (South Asia Institute) and held a research fellowship with the University of Tübingen. Her research interests include the history of encounters between European and non-European cultures, German Orientalism, and British colonialism in India. Her recent publications include *From Salon to Discipline: State, University and Indology in Germany, 1821–1914* (2005), 'Indologie', in *Enzyklopädie der Neuzeit* (2007), and 'Sacred Space and the Making of Monuments in Colonial Orissa', in H. P. Ray (ed.), *Archaeology and the Text: The Temple in South Asia* (forthcoming). Her current research project is on archaeology, monuments, and sacred space in colonial India.

MARTINA STEBER studied history, German, and theology at the Universities of Augsburg and Cambridge. Before joining the GHIL in 2007 she worked as a Lecturer at the Universities of Augsburg and Eichstätt-Ingolstadt. A monograph based on her Ph.D. thesis on the relevance of regionality between the German Kaiserreich and the National Socialist regime will appear in 2009. She has published on the *Heimat* movement, mental mapping, National Socialist cultural politics, and the British historian Herbert Butterfield. Her main fields of interest include modern regional history, the history of historiography, and the history of the political sphere in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. While at the GHIL she is engaging in research on British and German conservatism in the long 1960s.

BENEDIKT STUCHTEY is Deputy Director of the GHIL. His main research interest is presently the history of European imperialism and he will publish his *Habilitationsschrift* on anti-colonialism from the early modern period to the twentieth century in a comparative perspective in the series *Studien zur Internationalen Geschichte* (Oldenbourg, Munich). His most recent publication is (ed.), *Science across the European Empires, 1800–1950* (2005) and he is working on a new project on the history of adoption. A former editor of the *GHIL Bulletin*, he is on the boards of *European Review of History*, *Revue Européenne d'Histoire* and *Storia della Storiografia. History of Historiography*.

KARINA URBACH joined the GHIL in January 2004 as a Research Fellow in twentieth-century history. She studied modern history and political science at the University of Munich and took an M.Phil. in international relations and a Ph.D. in history at the University of Cambridge. She taught at the University of Bayreuth. Her fields of interest include British–German relations in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. She is the editor of *European Aristocracies and the Radical Right in the Interwar Years* (2007) and *Royal Kinship: British–German Family Networks 1815–1914* (2008).

Forthcoming Conferences

Keeping Secrets: How Important was Intelligence to the Conduct of International Relations from 1914 to 1989? Conference to be held at the GHIL, 17–19 April 2008. Organizer: Dr Karina Urbach (GHIL).

The study of intelligence has long had a negative press. Until recently it was seen as a cloak-and-dagger genre confined to cranks and amateur code-breakers. The conference will ask at what points, if at all, military and political intelligence played a decisive role in the history of twentieth-century Europe. We will examine intelligence from its early stages technologically during the First World War to the more complex operations during the Cold War. This raises the obvious question: did the advances in interception and decryption transform the contribution of intelligence to the conduct of international relations? For our purpose, five countries and their intelligence agencies form the focus of the conference: the USA, Russia, Great Britain, Germany, and France.

For further information please contact Dr Karina Urbach:
kurbach@ghil.ac.uk

Noticeboard

Consumers in the Public Sphere. Conference to be held at the GHIL, 23–24 May 2008. Organizer: Dr Kerstin Brückweh (GHIL).

In the foreword to the 1990 German reprint of his *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Jürgen Habermas judged his original work of 1962 to have been, in part, too pessimistic. He felt that his description of a manipulated, passive audience, which was published after the Second World War, was too greatly influenced by his own primary experience and contemporary observation. In 1990 he argued that his earlier diagnosis of a linear development from a politically active citizen to a privately acting consumer was inadequate. In 2008, with the empirical backing of studies in the history of consumption and citizenship, it is quite easy to see how Habermas came to his assessment in 1962 and why he revised it in 1990. The 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s in Europe were a time of struggle between different concepts of democracy, citizenship, and consumption. This debate was influenced by the US, which brought its own concept of a 'consumers' republic' (Lizabeth Cohen) to Europe, in part through the Marshall Plan. However, the American model was not simply adapted by European societies; rather, nations such as Germany, the UK, and France had their own traditions of trade unions and social democracy and ideas of the welfare state, and traditions of products and consumption. These heritages and national histories affected the debates on the relationship between democracy, citizenship and consumption.

The aim of this conference is to ask how the political public sphere in Western Europe after 1945 can be defined from the point of view of historians of consumption. How has consumption influenced the understanding of politics? Two areas can be considered good starting points for periodizing, comparing, and conceptualizing the public sphere because two main types of consumers have appeared in the public sphere of political debate since the Second World War: firstly, organized consumers, for example, consumer movements in which citizens' consumer groups actively formed to speak for themselves on specific issues. This category also included consumer experts who were involved in governmental decision-making; and secondly, unorganized consumers whose opinions were expressed via market research institutes. They did not speak out for themselves but merely answered the questions of market researchers. Thus they did not constitute an organized group but were taken as a collection of indi-

vidual opinions which, regarded as representative samples of society as a whole, formed the consumers' opinion. Surveying opinions and attitudes added a new technique of disciplinary power to the twentieth century. This technique was applied to both politics and consumption, and seemed to have a significant influence on the perception of the public sphere from the Second World War onwards. By asking about the influences of organized and unorganized consumers on the political public sphere, the conference aims to define the political sphere in a consumer society.

For further information please contact Dr Kerstin Brückweh:
kbrueckweh@ghil.ac.uk

Imperial Legacies: The Afterlife of Multi-Ethnic Empires in the Twentieth Century. Conference to be held at the GHIL, 14-16 September 2008. Organizers: Benedikt Stuchtey (GHIL); Jörn Leonhard (Freiburg); Ulrike von Hirschhausen (Hamburg).

All empires generate their own legacies. The dissolution of Europe's three continental empires at the end of the First World War, the British and French reorientation regarding their maritime empires, and, finally, the process of decolonization after 1945 did not simply mark the end of imperial experiences. The many successor states which emerged from the Tsarist empire, the Habsburg monarchy, and the Ottoman empire after 1918, and post-colonial states and societies after the 1950s, were confronted with many political and social models as well as cultural paradigms from the imperial past. In addition there was an element of continuity among administrative, military, and economic elites, which influenced the transition from empires to a post-imperial world. Whether distancing themselves from the past or searching for new models of legitimacy, post-imperial states and societies were constantly accompanied and challenged by their different past experiences.

Against the background of a research focus shifting from a concentration on the seemingly inevitable decline and dissolution of empires to a differentiated analysis of integrative and disintegrative elements of imperial rule in multi-ethnic societies and their long-term

Noticeboard

consequences, the conference will look at a set of general questions. Where is it possible to identify lines of continuity between the imperial past and post-imperial realities after the First World War and the Second World War? How did imperial legacies influence the self-images of post-imperial states and societies? How did they contribute to the development of a new international system, new political cultures, and different dealings with the past?

In an attempt to combine synchronic and diachronic dimensions of comparative analysis, the conference will look at imperial legacies of both the successor states of the east European and south-east European empires after 1918, namely, Tsarist Russia, the Habsburg empire, and the Ottoman empire, and west European cases after 1945, focusing in particular on Britain and France during and after the period of decolonization. The conference will be divided into three sessions followed by a concluding panel discussion to allow for detailed analysis of specific cases and to bring together these aspects in a more general discussion about the meaning of the imperial past in the modern world.

Session I: *Alliances, Spheres of Interest, Conflict Strategies: The Legacies of Multi-Ethnic Empires in Twentieth-Century International Relations*. All post-imperial states had to formulate new interests, define new positions, and search for new alliances in international relations. This particular challenge contributed much to the complexity of the international system in both post-war periods. Which elements of the imperial past served as markers for foreign political orientation? What did the imperial legacy actually mean for the definition of new zones of geo-political or strategic interests? What were the differences between the empires' 'rump-states' on the one hand and the successor states on the other? Was there a continuity of foreign political elites?

Session II: *Representation and Leadership: The Afterlife of Empire in Political Cultures*. Distancing themselves from the imperial past was certainly one option for formulating a new political and social legitimacy for post-imperial societies. Yet this perspective tends to overshadow lines of continuity regarding both political and constitutional structures and the symbolic communication of politics. Where is it possible to identify imperial legacies, for instance, combining the

political institutions of dynastic empires with new republics? Were there elements of post-imperial political cultures which were derived from the imperial past? Which imperial traditions could be used to develop new styles of leadership?

Session III: *Dealing with Multiple Pasts: Empire Historiographies and Education*. All successor states and post-imperial societies had to find new ways to legitimize their new existence or their new position. The invention of a particular politics of imperial history made the past a major source for legitimacy. Against this background, this session concentrates on empire historiographies and the meaning of the imperial past in education. How did historiography and education actually deal with imperial legacies? Which elements of the imperial past were selected? How were they interpreted and popularized? And how successful were they in formulating a new legitimacy?

Panel Discussion: *Imperial Legacies in the Modern World*

Trajectories of Decolonization: Elites and the Transformation from the Colonial to the Post-Colonial. Conference to be held in Cologne, 9-12 October 2008. Organizers: Jost Dülffer (Cologne); and Marc Frey (Bremen) with Andreas Gestrich and Benedikt Stuchtey (both GHIL).

For more information please contact Marc Frey:
m.frey@jacobs-university.de

Terrorism and Modernity: Global Perspectives on Nineteenth-Century Political Violence. Conference to be held in New Orleans, 23-26 October 2008. Organizers: Benedikt Stuchtey (GHIL); Carola Dietze (GHI Washington); Claudia Verhoeven (George Mason University, Washington).

Since 11 September 2001, talk of 'postmodern terrorism' has become ubiquitous. 'Postmodern terrorism' presupposes 'modern terrorism'. Accordingly, in the past few years, sociologists, political scientists, and specialists in contemporary history have often classified specific forms

Noticeboard

of political violence in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Europe and the US as 'modern terrorism'. Thus far, however, they have neither been able to define convincingly the characteristics of 'modern terrorism' nor shown the concrete connections between modernity and terrorism. Moreover, the work tends to be Eurocentric: irregular political violence in Latin America, South and East Asia, and Africa – that is, in regions of the world not counted among the forefront of modernity – tends to be excluded from discussions of terrorism.

Through this conference we seek to explore the emergence of terrorism in the nineteenth century. Taking the critique of Eurocentric history writing into account, we want to examine this form of political violence on a global scale without presupposing 'modernity'. Instead, taking up recent trends in the writing of global history, we will research the connections between large-scale political and social changes in the world of the nineteenth century and the changes in the use of political violence towards what has come to be understood as 'terrorism'. In this way we hope to contribute to the understanding of terrorism and the discussion of modernity, as well as to the new ways of writing world history.

Topics may examine the relationship between terrorism (and related forms of political violence) and:

- globalization, colonialism, imperialism
- democratization, capitalism, urbanization, technology
- media, literature, art
- gender, class, race
- modernity/modernities

as well as terrorism and related forms of political violence in historiography.

Engineering Society: The Scientization of the Social in Comparative Perspective, 1880 to 1990. Conference to be held at the Humanities Research Institute, University of Sheffield, 20–22 November 2008. Organizers: Benjamin Ziemann (Sheffield); Dirk Schumann (Bremen); Richard Wetzell (GHI Washington); and Kerstin Brückweh (GHIL).

‘Scientization of the social’ is a concept that has been developed to analyse the dynamics of the application of the social sciences to social problems and the impact these sciences have had both on the structures and the self-descriptions of modern societies since the late nineteenth century. The concept directs the attention of historians to the manifold ways in which various disciplines from the social sciences, sciences humaines, or Humanwissenschaften have classified and calculated social phenomena by statistical means, described anomic situations and social problems, developed blueprints for welfare-state planning, and provided means for therapeutic intervention in the problems of individuals.

Since the ‘scientization of the social’ was suggested as a research agenda for contemporary history by the historian Lutz Raphael in 1996, it has been used to achieve a number of objectives. First, the concept was intended to criticize straightforward notions of progress and liberalization in the historiography of twentieth-century Western societies. A second aim was to integrate the social sciences into the narratives of general history, which mostly tended to mention the history of science as a mere cultural phenomenon or a less important speciality. Thirdly, the focus on processes of scientization was intended to make it possible to conceptualize contemporary history as the ‘prehistory of current problem constellations’ (H. G. Hockerts), rather than to overestimate the significance of the repercussions of the Second World War and/or German occupation in this period. And finally, a focus on scientization also allows us to engage in an interdisciplinary dialogue with sociologists of science in a field which, under labels such as ‘knowledge society’ and ‘expert knowledge’, has seen some of the most fascinating sociological debates in recent years. In the past decade, a growing number of historians from different backgrounds and with different methodological interests have explored various aspects of the ‘scientization of the social’ in the history of various Western European countries, but particularly with regard to the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and the USA,

Noticeboard

which is also important as a reference point for comparisons. This international conference aims to establish a preliminary survey of the research in this field and to clarify uncertainties in the concept itself, in a long-term and internationally comparative perspective, covering the period from 1880 to 1990. The conference will be organized in three main panels: (1) Social and Penal Policy; (2) Organizations, Polling, and Marketing; and (3) Diagnosis and Therapy. A keynote lecture by Professor Lutz Raphael (University of Trier) will introduce the topic of the conference.

For further information please contact Dr Kerstin Brückweh: kbrueckweh@ghil.ac.uk or one of the other organizers.

German History Society

The German History Society's Annual General Meeting will take place on Saturday, 25 October 2008 at the German Historical Institute. In conjunction with the AGM there will be a one-day conference on the theme of 'Africa in Germany, Germany in Africa'. Speakers will include Vera Lind (Northern Illinois University), Bernhard Gißibl (Mannheim), Jürgen Zimmerer (Sheffield), Larissa Förster (Cologne), Wolfgang Fuhrmann (Kassel), and Ulrich van der Heyden (Berlin). Attendance is free and everyone is welcome. For further details please contact the Secretary of the Society, Annika Mombauer (A.Mombauer@open.ac.uk).

German History Society Essay Prize

The German History Society (GHS), in association with the Royal Historical Society (RHS), will award a prize of £500 to the winner of an essay competition. The 2008 Essay Prize Competition will follow the same format as in previous years. The rules are as follows:

- (1) The essay can be on any aspect of German History, including the history of German-speaking people both within and beyond Europe.
- (2) Any postgraduate registered for a degree in a university in either the UK or the Republic of Ireland is eligible to enter the competition. All postgraduates who submitted their dissertation within the last twelve months are also eligible.

Noticeboard

- (3) The text of the essay must not exceed 10,000 words.
- (4) Two hard copies of the essay must be submitted to the office of the RHS, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT by Monday 16 June 2008 along with details of the author's name, address (including e-mail address), institutional affiliation and degree registration.
- (5) The essays submitted will be read by a jury of three historians, two nominated by the GHS and one by the RHS. (The two societies reserve the right to nominate additional jurors if this is considered appropriate.)
- (6) The jury reserves the right not to award a prize in any particular year.
- (7) The decision of the jury is final.
- (8) The jury will make its decision by October 2008
- (9) The prize will be presented to the winner at the Annual General Meeting of the GHS on 25 October 2008.
- (10) The essay will be considered for publication in GERMAN HISTORY.
- (11) The competition will run for a trial period and be reviewed annually.